DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 434 PS 014 323

AUTHOR Malgieri, Patty; And Others
TITLE Income Eligible Day Care Client Impact Survey: Effects of Cutting Day Care Subsidies to Low Income Families.
INSTITUTION Center for Governmental Research, Inc., Rochester, NY.
PUB DATE Dec 83
NOTE 88p.; Prepared for the Human Services Data Sharing Project, Monroe County, NY.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Surveys; Coping; *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; *Family Characteristics; *Family Income; *Federal Aid; *Low Income; Public Policy; Questionnaires; *Retrenchment
IDENTIFIERS Dependency (Economic); New York (Monroe County); Reagan Administration; Subsidized Child Care Services

ABSTRACT

One of a series, this background paper is intended to provide accurate, objective, and comprehensive information regarding the content and effects of new federal approaches to the funding and delivery of human services at the local level. Contents specifically focus on effects in Monroe County, New York, and concern a study of families losing county day care subsidies. Described are characteristics of affected families, methods of coping with subsidy loss, effects of cuts on the creation of other dependencies, and other problems encountered by excluded families. Participating were 191 families whose subsidies were cut but who became eligible for another subsidy and 111 family care recipients who were ineligible for any subsidy. Because of some overlap between groups, the total population of families was 293. A total of 430 children using some form of county subsidized care were affected. Findings showed that the loss of a day care subsidy had many negative effects. Policy recommendations concluded that the findings of the survey offer compelling reasons to be concerned about the provision of day care subsidies to certain lower income families. Not only did these subsidies enhance the quality of life of many hundreds of children and their parents but they also provided an effective tool in reinforcing individual work efforts. (Survey methodology is described in a technical appendix, and the interview questionnaire is included.) (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Center for Governmental Research Inc.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Human Services Data
Sharing Project
Monroe County, New York

Client Impact Survey
(12/83)

ED242434

INCOME ELIGIBLE DAY CARE CLIENT IMPACT SURVEY: EFFECTS OF CUTTING DAY CARE SUBSIDIES TO LOW INCOME FAMILIES

Federal Government Retrenchment: Issues of Fairness, Cost Effectiveness, and Services.

Federal Cutbacks: Facts/Issues/Local Effects

This is one of a series of background papers intended to provide accurate, objective, and comprehensive information regarding the content and effects of new federal approaches to the funding and delivery of human services at the local level--and specifically focusing on effects in Monroe County. Titles of other papers are listed below.

This paper focuses on a study of families losing county day care subsidies. The study took place in March and April of 1983. It describes the characteristics of those cut, the effects of cuts on creating other dependencies, as well as the problems encountered by those cut. Policy conclusions are presented.

Any comments or questions concerning this paper should be raised with the contacts listed on the back of this page. Copies of this and other available papers may be obtained from the same contacts.

OTHER AVAILABLE PAPERS IN THIS SERIES

- AFDC [Release #1 (7/82)]
- Title XX Services [Release #1 (10/82)]
- Food Stamps [Release #1 (10/82)]
- Medicaid [Release #1 (10/82)]
- Services to the Elderly [Release #1 (11/82)]
- Medicare [Release #1 (11/82)]
- Employment and Training [Release #1 (1/83)]
- Mental Health Services [Release #1 (1/83)]
- Low/Moderate Income Housing [Release #1 (5/83)]
- Cutting Welfare Benefits to Working Mothers [12/83]

PS 014323

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dianne Salopek
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HUMAN SERVICES DATA SHARING PROJECT
Monroe County, New York

Federal and state government budget cuts and redirections that are occurring are having an effect on the programs of local human service agencies and funders.

To help this community deal with the changes that are taking place, nine local planning and funding organizations have joined together in a project aimed at gathering and sharing data that will help funders and providers in the community plan for the future.

Project sponsors include: the City of Rochester; the County of Monroe; the United Way of Greater Rochester; Catholic Charities; the Genesee Ecumenical Ministries; the Jewish Community Federation of Rochester; the Urban League; the Rochester Grantmakers Forum; and the Center for Governmental Research. Information gathered by the group will be shared with the entire community.

Sponsors of the project hope to gather accurate, objective information about specific program changes and how they may be expected to affect needy families and individuals in the region. The project will attempt to build baseline data about the kinds of programs and types of people that will be most severely affected by the cuts.

Program Topics Under Study

AFDC	Services to Elderly
Title XX	Mental Health Services
Medicaid	Public Health
Medicare	CETA/Training
Food Stamps	Housing
Education	Community Development
Cultural Activities	Community Action
Child Day Care	

INCOME ELIGIBLE DAY CARE CLIENT IMPACT SURVEY

FOR COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/COPIES OF THIS PAPER
PLEASE CONTACT:

Principal Author: Patty Malgieri, Senior Research Analyst
Center for Governmental Research Inc.
325-6360 (or Alan Taddiken, Project Director)

Other Contributors:
John Farie, Deputy Director for Services
Monroe County Department of Social Services
442-4000
Dan Ross, Planning Coordinator
Monroe County Department of Social Services
442-4000

Steering Committee Contacts:
Charles Mulligan - 328-3210
Tom Toole - 454-2770

Acknowledgements

The Center for Governmental Research wishes to acknowledge the support it received from many sources during the conduct of this study. Sarah Liebschutz, State University College at Brockport, provided special assistance in questionnaire development and through provision of students as volunteer interviewers. Charles Mulligan, Diocese of Rochester, and Lawrence Witmer, Genesee Ecumenical Ministries, also assisted through volunteer recruitment. Donna MacIntosh of the Monroe County Department of Social Services guided us through their computer systems.

R. Danforth Ross, also of the Department of Social Services, and Thomas Toole, Thomas Swartz and Ruthe Trost of the United Way of Greater Rochester provided comments and guidance throughout the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
POLICY OVERVIEW/SUMMARY	S-1
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background	1
B. Short History of Income Eligible Day Care in Monroe County	2
C. The Department of Social Services Survey in 1981	3
D. Purpose of This Survey (in 1983)	5
II. FINDINGS	8
A. Characteristics	8
o Family Size	8
o Age of Family Members	8
o Geographic Location	10
o Welfare Support at Time of Cut	12
o Lost Benefits	12
o United Way Subsidy	13
o Determinants and Effects of UW Subsidy	14
B. Methods of Coping	16
o Child Care Arrangements (Number, Types, Satisfaction, Successful Adjustment)	17
o Reliance on Supplemental Sources of Income	25
o Changes in Household Composition	26
o Modifications of Employment Status	27
o Financial Coping	28
C. Dependency Issues	29
o Forms of Dependency	29
o Dates of Denied Application	31
o Current Participation in Welfare	32
o Determinants and Effects of Welfare Dependency	34
o Other Services Dependency	35
D. Other Consequences/Problems of Subsidy Loss	36
o Children's Behavior in Home or Day Care	36
o Effects on Children's Health	37
o Effects on Children's Safety	38
o Changes in School Performance	39
o Effects on Household Heads	40
III. POLICY CONCLUSIONS	44
A. Overview of Findings/Implications	44
B. Perspective on the Income Issue	46
C. Recent Policy Directions	47
TECHNICAL APPENDIX	53
o Survey Methodology	53
o Sample Bias and Limitations of Current Research	59
NOTES	62
QUESTIONNAIRE	

Effects of Cutting Day Care Subsidies to Low Income Families

POLICY OVERVIEW/SUMMARY

Background

In Monroe County, more than 10,000 additional people were poor in 1979 than in 1969. A total of 60,000 people were living in poverty in 1979. Approximately 21,000 people were living between 100 percent and 124 percent of the poverty level, and another 22,000 people were living between 125 percent and 150 percent of poverty. While the vast majority (over 75 percent) of the county's residents have incomes at least twice the poverty level, these numbers present a perspective on the fact that many are not very well off.

Those living near the poverty level income line include a substantial number of families headed by single women--many with pre-school or school age children. In 1980, Monroe County had nearly 10,000 families with incomes between $10,000 and $12,499--and another 9,600 families had incomes between $12,500 and $14,999. Approximately 8,600 families had incomes near the poverty level ($7,500 to $9,999). Many of these families are headed by women. It is well recognized that such families have daily problems providing for such basic necessities as food, housing, clothing, and child care.

Within this setting, cutbacks by the Reagan administration in federally supported human services, particularly for those near or below the poverty level, were viewed with alarm by many sectors of the community. Dozens of programs assisting low income persons were reduced. Among these, major programs aimed at assisting families with children were cutback. Of particular interest here were cuts in Title XX social services funding, which, in combination with generally reduced federal grants to states and local governments, affected the ability of county government to continue certain non-mandated services such as homemaker assistance, child protective staff, and day care subsidies for lower income families. (Another paper in this series, Title XX Services - Background Paper, explores services issues in general.)

It is this background that motivated the Human Services Data Sharing Project to undertake a survey of low income families losing county day care subsidies in 1981. This report describes the results of a 1983 study of 293 families with low income employed heads of households, whose Income Eligible Day Care subsidies were terminated when Monroe County discontinued the program on June 30, 1981. Primarily a client impact survey, the purpose of the study was to assess how the families adjusted their child care upon the loss of the full county subsidy, how the children and heads of households personally coped with the need to find alternative arrangements, and how they were impacted by the new arrangements themselves.

Policy Concerns

Findings Support Subsidy Program. The findings of this survey offer compelling reasons to be concerned about the provision of day care subsidies to certain lower income families. There is evidence that these subsidies enhance the quality of life of many hundreds of children and their parents, and that they provide a tool for reinforcing individual work efforts.

Need for County Priority Setting. While the results of this study are positive in supporting day care subsidies for lower income families ("income eligible day care"), the survey does not indicate the relative importance of day care subsidies compared to other social service needs (e.g., foster care, child and adult protective, information and referral services, etc.). The Title XX planning process should continue to accommodate input from a wide variety of community groups on the issue of how best to allocate Title XX resources and other resources to all social services including day care subsidies.

Need for Supplementary Private/Public Support. Beyond county day care subsidies, other avenues of community support are essential. These include: (1) before and after school care for preschool and primary school-age children within public schools; (2) more widespread use of satellite family care homes tied to day care centers; (3) increased United Way and county funding of day care subsidies for part-time workers and students; (4) greatly enhanced interest on the part of business in establishing on-location day care and other employee day care subsidies.

Targeting Subsidies. Day care subsidies should be particularly targeted to families whose youngest child is less than six and whose income is between the poverty level and 150 percent of that level (e.g., roughly $8,000 to $12,000 for a family of three).

Recent County Policy Directions/Services Access. The county's reestablishment of income eligible day care has raised issues concerning program use. This survey shows that the 1981 elimination of the subsidy caused families to make other child care arrangements. It will take time before parents hear about the new slots, feel assured of their relative permanence, and finally commit to them. Heavy publicity for the revived program is essential for an accurate picture of demand.

Day Care Vouchers. The results of both this survey and the survey of mothers losing income maintenance (ADC) support (see report Cutting Welfare Benefits to Working Mothers) indicate the need for a more flexible system of providing day care subsidies--as a supplement to the present slot system. A voucher system would subsidize more types of day care alternatives.

Summary of Findings

Some data on all 293 families losing subsidies were available through Department of Social Services files. The information on alternative arrangements used and impacts of the cuts, however, was generated through a telephone survey which produced statistically generalizable results.

A summary of the study's major findings is provided here, grouped under four categories:

A. Characteristics (population as a whole)
B. Methods of Coping (sample group only)
C. Dependency (population as a whole)
D. Other Consequences of Subsidy Loss (sample group only)

A. Characteristics

o Number of children in population?
The 293 families cut included 642 children, 430 of whom were using some form of county subsidized care at the time of termination (either family care or day care center).

o Average number of children per family?
The average number of children per family was two.

o Average age of children?
The average age of all children at termination was approximately seven; 48 percent were pre-schoolers. In addition, 74 percent of families had at least one child of school age who could be expected to need supplemental care.

The average age of children receiving subsidized care at time of termination was approximately five; their range of ages was less-than-one to 13 years.

o Average age and marital status of household head?
The most common age range for terminated heads of households at the time of the survey was 22-29 years. Eighty-three percent of respondents were not living with a husband at the time of termination. (Almost 100 percent of survey respondents were women.)

o Geographic concentration?
Sixty-six percent of the terminated families' last known addresses are concentrated in six City of Rochester zip codes in the central and northeastern sectors. Only nine percent live in non-city zip codes.

o United Way subsidy receipt?
Since the time of the Income Eligible subsidy cut, 39 percent of terminated families have at one time or another received a partial United Way subsidy.

- o Significant determinants of UW subsidy receipt?
  Age of youngest child at the time of the survey was a significant determinant of receipt of such a UW subsidy. Families whose youngest child was between three and five years old were significantly more likely than expected to receive a UW subsidy. Only one of the 28 families whose youngest child was nine years or above received a UW subsidy.

  Last known address, number of children, age of household head and whether the family received public assistance at the time of the cut or since were not significant determinants of UW subsidy receipt.

- o UW subsidy receipt as significant determinant of client impacts?
  Receipt/non-receipt of a UW subsidy since 7-1-81 was a significant determinant of whether a respondent identified a problem for at least one child in one of the following areas due to loss of the county subsidy: behavior at home or in day care, children's health, their safety, or their school performance. A subsidy recipient was significantly less likely than expected to mention a problem in these specified areas.

  Another result of receipt of a UW subsidy is the number of child care arrangements currently used by the family. Families receiving a UW subsidy at any time since 7-1-81 are significantly less likely than expected to be using three or more child care arrangements currently.

  Receipt/non-receipt of a UW subsidy since 7-1-81 was an insignificant determinant of the following variables:

  - o ability to handle child care and work responsibilities
  - o "ability to achieve" for the family
  - o satisfaction with arrangements used since subsidy loss
  - o need to become newly dependent on ADC, NPA-FS or NPA-MA since 7-1-81

B. Methods of Coping with Subsidy Loss

- o Average number of day care arrangements used per child?
  The average number of different arrangements used each week per child increased from 1.5 immediately prior to the subsidy cut to 1.7 at the time of interview.

  The percentage of children in one child care arrangement per week has decreased from 59 percent prior to the subsidy cut to 48.4 percent at time of interview while the percentage in three or more arrangements per week has increased from 8.9 percent to 17.9 percent.

- o Types of child care arrangements used?
  Structured methods of care (day care centers and certified family care providers) comprised 46 percent of all methods used prior to the subsidy cut, but only 14 percent of methods used at time of interview.

- o Reliance on controversial alternative methods of care?
  The instances of children being supervised by babysitting siblings increased from three percent of all arrangements used prior to the subsidy cut to eight percent of those used at time of interview. This represents an increase from five percent of children needing care prior to the cut to 17 percent of those still needing care in 1983.

  The average age of babysitting siblings was 16 prior to the subsidy cut, 15 years at the time of interview. The average age of children being babysat for by siblings rose over this period from just over five years to just under eight years.

  The instances of children left alone part of the day increased from seven percent of all arrangements used prior to the subsidy cut to 11 percent of those used at time of interview. This represents an increase from 13 percent of children needing care prior to the cut to 25 percent of those still needing care in 1983.

  The average age of children 12 or under being left alone part of the day rose from eight years prior to the subsidy cut to nine years at time of interview. At both points in time, verified cases were found of five and six year olds being left home alone.

- o Satisfaction with current arrangements?
  Over 50 percent of survey respondents reported feeling less satisfied with arrangements they have needed to use since loss of the subsidy.

- o Assessment of level of children's adjustment?
  In the opinion of survey respondents, almost 70 percent of the children whose adjustment levels were apparent had adjusted over time "very well" or "pretty well" to post-cut arrangements. Eight percent have adjusted "not very well" or "very badly."

- o Change in "ability to achieve" since loss of subsidy?
  Over 44 percent of survey respondents admitted feeling less positive currently as compared to the time under the subsidy in their ability to achieve what they wanted for their families. The most frequently cited expanation for this assessment was that the respondent felt "less secure financially" or had to "downgrade goals for the future."

- o Change in average monthly take-home pay since subsidy cut?
  The average monthly take-home pay for employed respondents at time of subsidy cut was $550, while in 1983 it had increased to $625.

- o Change in household composition since subsidy cut?
  Household composition of survey families remained substantially unchanged from 1981 to 1983; in both years approximately two-thirds of the respondents had no one living with them who could help with child care.

- o Change in employment status due to loss of subsidy and need to make new arrangements?

  Approximately seven percent of survey respondents reported quitting work and remaining out of the workplace due to subsidy loss in order to handle child care. Of those who stayed in the work force, 19 percent reduced work hours as a result of needing to use new arrangements. In addition, 17.5 percent of those who stayed in the work force underwent some other type of job change in order to cope with child care needs, such as change in place of employment and/or shift.

- o Change in ability to handle child care and work since subsidy loss?
  Over 40 percent of survey respondents reported that they found it more difficult now as opposed to while under the subsidy to handle child care and work responsibilities.

- o Modification of family's financial habits to compensate for subsidy loss?
  Over 80 percent of survey respondents reported using one or more of the listed methods of juggling finances in order to cope with the loss of subsidy. Almost one-third of the respondents reported using all the methods asked about, including not buying adequate food, clothing or medicines for the family and needing to borrow money from other people, bank or lending company.

C. Dependency

- o Number receiving welfare support at time of cut?
  Of the 293 terminated families, 83 of them (28 percent) were receiving Non-Public Assistance Medicaid (NPA-MA) and/or Non-Public Assistance Food Stamps (NPA-FS) on June 30, 1981. Ninety-four percent of these recipients continued to receive these benefits, at least temporarily, following their cut in subsidy.

  Because of excess income, Income Eligible subsidy recipients could not simultaneously receive Basic Assistance.

- o Increases in dependency following subsidy cut?
  Of the 293 Income Eligible families, 99 (34 percent) became newly dependent after the subsidy cut on one or more forms of welfare (ADC/HR, NPA-MA and/or NPA-FS) on which they were not dependent on June 30, 1981. Specifically, 59 families began receiving ADC after the subsidy cut.

In addition to these families, 32 other families applied for one or more forms of welfare since the subsidy cut, but have been denied.

Therefore, an unduplicated count of families who became newly dependent on one or more forms of welfare to which they had not been dependent on June 30, 1981, or who applied for and were denied one or more forms since that time represents 45 percent of all terminated families.

- o Current participation in welfare programs?
  The number of families dependent on one or more forms of welfare on the date of subsidy cut vs. date of interview decreased from 83 to 70, particularly as a result of decreases under NPA-FS.

  Of the 70 currently participating families, 54 became newly dependent on one or more forms since June 30, 1981. On the other hand, 51 of the 83 Income Eligible families who were dependent on the welfare system at the time of the cut no longer are.

- o Significant determinants of new dependency?
  Families whose youngest child at time of interview was less than six were significantly more likely than expected to become dependent on one or more forms of welfare on which they were not dependent on June 30, 1981.

  Variables which proved to be insignificant determinants of welfare status were receipt of UW subsidy, number of children less than three or between six and eleven, age of household head, and number of children.

- o Receipt of welfare since loss of subsidy as significant determinant of other variables?
  Receipt of welfare since June 30, 1981 was shown to be a significant determinant of the number of children's current problem areas identified by the respondent. Respondents who had been dependent at some point since subsidy loss were significantly less likely than expected to have identified problems with their children's behavior, health, safety or school performance.

  Receipt of welfare was an insignificant determinant of the following variables: ability to handle child care and work, ability to achieve, satisfaction with arrangements used and number of arrangements used.

D. Other Consequences/Problems of Subsidy Loss

o Effects on children's behavior?
Respondents reported that 34 percent of all children had exhibited negative behavioral effects at home or in day care (attributable to changes in arrangements made necessary by subsidy loss). Examples of such behaviors mentioned most often were the following: is more withdrawn, exhibits more aggression or hostility, gets along less compatibly with other children. Four percent of all children were affected positively in their behavior.

o Effects on children's safety?
Respondents reported that 33 percent of all children were currently in at least one child care arrangement which causes them to worry. The most often cited worrisome arrangements were the following: child is left alone for at least part of day; child is left with a too young or inexperienced caregiver; the new arrangement involves less supervision. All other children were reported to have no safety problems.

o Effects on school performance?
Fourteen percent of children who were in school at the time of subsidy cut exhibited negative changes in school performance which parents attributed to new care arrangements, such as receiving poorer grades, losing interest in doing well, or doing homework less consistently. Two percent of children were reported to have experienced positive school performance.

o Increased need for household heads to use back-up methods of care?
Of all respondents, 51 percent needed to rely on last-minute emergency back-up methods of care more frequently now than before the subsidy cut.

o Types of employment effects identified?
Over 50 percent of respondents reported that their employment status has been affected negatively by the need to make new day care arrangements. Examples of such negative effects cited were the following: attendance less regular now, is less punctual now, can't work overtime anymore, can't accept additional responsibility. Six percent of respondents reported any positive work related effects.

o Types of household head personal problems coping with loss of subsidy?
Of all respondents, 78 percent identified personal problems which they attributed directly to loss of the Income Eligible subsidy and the subsequent need to make alternative arrangements. The most frequently cited effects were increased personal stress, frequent signs of illness such as headaches, strained personal relationships.

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

This survey was undertaken because of the need for more information about the effects of service and resource changes on individuals and families ("clients") in Monroe County. Information on the effects of lost benefits on clients was found to be either inadequate for planning purposes or completely unavailable (see various other project papers referenced on the title page). This particular survey of income eligible clients losing day subsidies was undertaken at the request of the Monroe County Department of Social Services. It is one of two conducted during the Human Services Data Sharing Project. The second survey focuses on families losing supplementary income and related benefits (Cutting Welfare Benefits to Working Mothers).

These client impact studies are contributing to a local understanding of what is happening to clients losing services. Such studies should assist in focusing planning efforts, examining existing policies, and prioritizing the use of public and private funds.

In addition to the limited analysis contained in this report, the results of the Day Care Survey are presented for study by program administrators and other members of the community. Indeed, the major orientation of this report is toward the objective presentation of survey findings. Further analysis for policy implications and program planning, beyond what is contained in this report, is probably desirable. A computer-based survey data set with documentation is available for further analysis through the Research Center--in addition to the tabulations presented here.

B. Short History of Income Eligible Day Care in Monroe County

Title XX of the Social Security Act, allowing broad state discretion over services, was enacted in 1975 to provide federal funds for social services--including day care services. Local social services mandated by New York State include day care provided for children under a child protective plan and for those receiving preventive services (since 1981). However, day care services based on income eligibility criteria are not mandated by the state.

Beginning in the early 1970's, the Monroe County Department of Social Services (DSS) under Title XX instituted a local (non-mandated) system of "income eligible day care," whereby low income, employed heads of households not on public assistance received full subsidies to cover either group or family day care.[1] In 1974, in cooperation with DSS, the United Way of Greater Rochester (UW) began providing partial subsidies on a sliding fee scale for group day care to low-to-moderate income clients above the DSS maximum income level. By 1980, the UW was also providing partially subsidized family day care for income eligibles. At the height of this period of growth, Monroe County provided full subsidies to persons earning up to $15,000 per year while UW partially subsidized those with annual incomes of $15,000-$21,000.

Beginning in the spring of 1980, however, a series of cuts in Title XX services was begun in order to adjust for an anticipated DSS deficit of $2 million. The DSS income eligibility level for non-mandated day care was reduced from 70 percent to 62 percent of state median income, and the 200 affected families then instead became eligible for partial UW subsidies (if they were using group day care).

By 1981, projections of continuing Title XX revenue shortfalls and general county budget considerations caused DSS to discontinue provision of all income eligible day care. Effective July 1, 1981, the UW began to underwrite partial subsidies for former income eligible clients using group day care centers. As a result, the UW eligibility levels were reduced and some low-to-moderate income recipients lost their UW subsidies (Group I). Group day care families whose county subsidies were cut thereby became eligible for partial UW subsidies (Group II).[2] Families receiving family day care subsidies were eliminated from service completely (Group III). This survey deals with the so-called Group II and III clients; that is, those with relatively lower incomes whose subsidies were either eliminated completely or substantially reduced as of July 1, 1981.[3]

C. The Department of Social Services Survey in 1981

Three months after the subsidy cut (in early October, 1981) DSS and UW undertook a joint survey to try to assess the impacts of these cuts on Groups I, II and III. The three main questions of interest were: (1) are clients finding ways to continue their day care; (2) did the loss of day care subsidies lead to an increase in referrals to Child Protective Services as a direct result of family stress or inability to continue adequate supervision of children; and (3) did a substantial number of clients need to resign work and become dependent on public assistance.

A one page questionnaire was sent to the approximately 450 families; responses were received from 109 clients. The major survey question asked was how child care needs were met after July 1, 1981, for each child. The following table shows the results:

HOW CHILD CARE NEEDS WERE MET (1981 SURVEY)

	Group I U.W. Cut		Group II Switched		Group III D.S.S. Cut	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Same Center or Home	19	43.2	49	57.0	34	26.2
Less Expensive Option	11	25.0	4	4.7	23	17.7
Work Changes	3	6.8	9	10.5	22	16.9
Informal Arrangements	9	20.5	17	19.8	30	23.1
Formal Arrangements	2	4.5	6	7.0	11	8.5
Welfare	0	0.0	1	1.1	10	7.7
Number of Responses	44	100.0	86	100.1	130	100.1
Number of Children	33		69		69	
Number of Responses/Child	1.33		1.26		1.88	

The main conclusion drawn from these findings by DSS and UW was that "most of the clients had made acceptable alternative child care arrangements even though some of these may have involved substantial changes in the household such as resigning work to stay at home, changing work hours, leaving children at home alone after school, or leaving children in the care of an older sibling."[4]

Child Protective Service records for three months after the cut, meanwhile, were checked for Groups II and III to see if day care subsidy cuts affected the number of such referrals. As stated in the report "there were only a few referrals (four) of these clients to Child Protective Services in the period...and none of these referrals could be directly attributed to the loss of day care."[5]

Finally, these same two groups were checked against the Welfare Management System (a client data base) to see if any were dependent on assistance three months after the cut. "Less than ten percent of the clients began receiving assistance... Further, of those who did nearly one-third were employed and were receiving assistance to supplement low wages."[6]

The overall conclusions of the DSS/UW report are that the majority of clients managed to continue in acceptable child care arrangements without resorting to additional public support in the form of public assistance or protective services. However, the authors readily admitted that the survey responses "do not adequately indicate the degree to which clients felt the impact of the cuts."[7] A substantial number of respondents had tacked onto the questionnaire some intriguing personal comments, hinting at how they were/were not satisfactorily coping with the cuts.

Officials within DSS and UW, as well as other representatives on the Human Services Data Sharing Project Committee, decided in the spring of 1983 to pursue further the question of how these Group II and III clients were specifically affected by the cuts and what coping mechanisms they relied on, using the longer-term perspective of 18 months since the cuts.

D. Purpose of This Survey (in 1983)

One purpose then in undertaking this survey was to update the information gathered by DSS and UW from the longer perspective of one and one-half years after the subsidy cut. Thus, the survey looked at the number of household heads who quit work because of day care problems and the number who became dependent on assistance or services; demographic data on household size, age of persons in the household, and the various combinations of alternative child care arrangements used since the cuts were reexamined, as well.

This survey also supplemented these earlier questions with others concerning factual data on these families at the time of the cut and now. Examples included questions on changing household composition, take-home pay and supplementary income sources. (See the Survey Questionnaire presented at

the end of this paper.) By analyzing all of these reexamined and newly examined variables, the survey shows how the households have changed over time and what contacts they have had with the DSS system since the subsidy cut.

As a "client impact survey," however, the questionnaire places significant emphasis on the issues of how these families were affected by the cuts and what coping mechanisms they used to adjust. (Note that all data on emotional, physical, behavioral or economic effects are drawn from the views of the respondent.) The survey deals with how changes in day care arrangements have affected, either negatively or positively, the home/school/day care behavior or performance of the children. In addition, much emphasis is given to each household head's perception of whether the childrens' safety is relatively more at risk under new alternative arrangements.

The questionnaire also contains a series of question items dealing with how the need to make any new arrangements, or the arrangements themselves, has personally affected the head of household. Question items review effects that the household head relates directly to the subsidy loss, such as medical problems, crises in interpersonal relationships or drug/alcohol abuse. Items cover specific ripple effects on the employment status of the household head--such as decreased ability to handle work/home responsibilities, reduced opportunities for overtime work or promotions and the like. As a corollary, question items were included to test specific economic impacts, such as lapses in ability to pay bills or buy household necessities as well as increased incidence of the need to borrow money.

The final goal of this survey was to draw conclusions about the relative prospects for self-sufficiency of these families. Research staff

hypothesized that, due to the passage of 18 months, some families would have found satisfactory solutions to reduced or eliminated subsidies (e.g., due to the simple fact of the childrens' aging) while some would have fallen even more severely through the "safety net" than was the case in October, 1981 at the time of the DSS survey. To that end, the heads of households were asked for an overall assessment of their "abilities to achieve" what they want for their families vis-a-vis their abilities while under the county subsidy.

II. FINDINGS

A. Characteristics

On June 30, 1981, 293 families were cut from the county day care subsidy program when non-mandated Income Eligible Day Care services were terminated. These families included 642 children, 430 of whom were using some form of county subsidized care at the time of family termination. The following sections will describe these families' major characteristics.

Family Size[1]

Most of the families had one or two children, with the average number of children being 2.2. Eleven percent of the families had four or more children.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER FAMILY
AT TIME OF TERMINATION (6-30-81)

# Children	Terminated Families #	Terminated Families %
1	95	32.4
2	94	32.1
3	71	24.2
4	24	8.2
5	4	1.4
6	5	1.7
Total	293	100.0
Mean	2.2 children	

Age of Family Members

The average age of all children (including those children not in county subsidized care) at the time of family termination was 6.9 years. Over 14 percent of the children were under three at the time of the cut, 47.7 percent were in the pre-school years of less than six. In addition, 74.4 percent of all families had at least one child of school age who could be expected to need supplemental child care (ages 6-11 inclusive).

AGE OF CHILDREN AT TIME OF FAMILY TERMINATION
(6-30-81)

Age	Children in Terminated Families #	%
Under 3	91	14.2
3 - 5	215	33.5
6 - 8	118	18.4
9 - 11	107	16.6
12 - 13	43	6.7
14 - 16	54	8.4
17 - 18	11	1.7
19+	3	0.5
Total	642	100.0
Mean	6.9 years	

By the time of the survey (March/April, 1983) the average age of all children in terminated families was 8.9 years. The average age of the youngest child in the family was 5.6 years.

FAMILIES BY AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD
ON 3-15-83

Age of Youngest Child	Terminated Families #	%
Under 3	20	6.8
3 - 5	124	42.3
6 - 8	121	41.3
9 - 11	22	7.5
12+	6	2.1
Total	293	100.0

Approximately 7 percent of the families had children less than three; 49 percent had children less than six.

FAMILIES BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN
LESS THAN THREE AND LESS THAN SIX ON 3-15-83

# Children/Family	Children Less than Three		Children Less than Six	
	# Families	% Families	# Families	% Families
0	273	93.2	149	50.9
1	19	6.5	126	43.0
2	1	.3	17	5.8
3	0	.0	1	0.3
Total	293	100.0	293	100.0

In addition to analyzing information on all children in terminated families, selective data was obtained for the 430 children who were in fact terminated from a subsidized form of care. Their range of ages at time of termination was from less-than-one to 13 years, with the average age at termination being approximately five years. Their average age at the time of the survey was just under seven years.

The most common age range for terminated heads of households at the time of survey data collection was 22-29 years old. Just 3.8 percent of the household heads were 21 or less, reflecting the fact that these persons were in the labor force and therefore predominantly older.

AGE OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD AS OF 3-15-83

Age	Terminated Household Heads	
	#	%
15 - 21	11	3.8
22 - 29	139	47.4
30 - 39	119	40.6
40+	24	8.2
Total	293	100.0

Geographic Location

The vast majority of terminated Income Eligible Day Care recipients live in the City of Rochester. Half of the population's last known zip codes were for four zip codes in the central and northeastern parts of the city

(14621, 14605, 14609, and 14608). With the addition of two other zip codes immediately adjacent to the central city (14611 and 14620), over 66 percent of the population is included. A small percent (9.2) live in the suburban areas of the county (other than Greece or Brighton).

FAMILIES BY LAST KNOWN GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

Area	# Families	% Families
Marketview Heights (14621)	40	13.7
Joseph Avenue (14604, 14605)	39	13.3
Beechwood (14609)	37	12.6
Federal Station (14608)	30	10.2
Bulls Head (14611)	27	9.2
Highland (14620)	21	7.2
West Ridge/Lyell (14606, 14613, 14615, 14624, 14626)	20	6.8
Thurston (14619)	14	4.8
Greece/Irondequoit (14612, 14616, 14617, 14622)	12	4.1
Southeast City/Brighton (14607, 14610, 14618, 14623, 14625)	20	6.8
Suburbs (144--, 145--)	27	9.2
Out of Area	6	2.1
	293	100.0

Income

Income data on the families under study are limited. In 1981, the average take-home pay for employed respondents was $549. In 1983, the average take-home pay was $625. While the term "take-home pay," used in this survey questionnaire, is generally accepted by the Census Bureau and others as an indicator of total gross (household) income, studies have found that persons with below median incomes tend to under-report their income.

Based on data collected in the survey, the estimated average gross (household) income from all sources of these families is $10,500 for 1983. Without further data collection, a similar estimate cannot be made for 1981. However, based on the survey of families losing ADC eligibility, it is likely that the income of the day care families in 1981 was in the range of $9,400 to

$10,000. (See discussion below, under "Policy Conclusions," concerning income.)

Welfare Support at Time of Cut

At the time of the elimination of Income Eligible Day Care on June 30, 1981, nearly 30 percent of the 293 affected families were also receiving some form of welfare support. An Income Eligible Day Care recipient by definition could not be simultaneously receiving Basic Assistance (i.e., Aid to Families with Dependent Children or Home Relief). However, some subsidy recipients were receiving Non-Public Assistance Medicaid (NPA-MA) and/or Non-Public Assistance Food Stamps (NPA-FS), as shown in the following table:

NPA-MA AND NPA-FS PARTICIPATION
AT TIME OF TERMINATION (6-30-81)

	Terminated Families	
Form of Support	#	%
NPA-MA only	5	1.7
NPA-FS only	49	16.7
NPA-MA and NPA-FS	29	9.9
Neither (MA nor FS)	210	71.7
Total	293	100.0

Lost Benefits

With rare exception, the Income Eligible subsidy recipients who simultaneously received NPA-MA or NPA-FS continued to receive these forms of support (as listed in the above table) following their cut in subsidy. Two families who received both NPA-MA and NPA-FS were cut from these on the day their day care subsidies were cut and have received neither since that time; the same is true for one family that was receiving NPA-FS only. In two other cases of families receiving NPA-FS, they were cut from this program on June 30, 1981 but have subsequently been picked up again. In sum, only five

families (6 percent) of the 83 receiving welfare support at the time of the subsidy cut were simultaneously affected by cuts in these programs as well.

United Way Subsidy

At the time of elimination of county day care subsidies to low income working persons, the United Way automatically certified all group day care subsidy recipients as eligible for partial UW subsidies (as of July 1, 1981). Many of the 191 families in this category, however, never actually activated this eligibility status for a variety of reasons: e.g., as they could not afford to pay the after-subsidy balance on their day care center bills and thus took their children out of structured care; their children had reached the age of not needing care as of the summer of 1981; or the families simply never formally registered with United Way. On the other hand, some families that were receiving subsidies for family care at the time of termination have since been picked up for UW subsidy.

For the families who did take advantage of UW eligibility, it was expected that the partial-subsidy would "cushion the blow" of the loss of the county's full-subsidy. To test this hypothesis, each of the 293 county terminated families was identified as a United Way subsidy recipient or non-recipient since July 1, 1981.

NUMBER OF FAMILIES RECEIVING UNITED WAY SUBSIDY SINCE 7-1-81

	Terminated Families	
Status	#	%
UW subsidy received	113	38.6
Never received	180	61.4
Total	293	100.0

Of the 113 terminated families who have received a UW subsidy since July 1, 1981, 95 of these were group day care subsidy recipients at the time of the cut. Thirteen of the 113 were receiving a county subsidy only for family care at the time of termination. The remaining five families that have received a UW subsidy since July 1, 1981 were receiving both county subsidized group care and family care as of June 30, 1981.

Determinants and Effects of UW Subsidy

Cross-tabulations were performed using the following demographic variables to determine if any were significant determinants of whether a family received a UW subsidy since July 1, 1981:

- o last known address
- o number of children
- o age of head of household
- o age of youngest child
- o whether the family had been on ADC, NPA-MA or NPA-FS at the time of the cut or since

Only the age of youngest child as of 3-15-83 proved to be a significant determinant of whether a family has received a UW subsidy since the loss of Income Eligible Day Care (at the .05 level).

Families whose youngest child was between three and five years old on 3-15-83 were significantly more likely than expected to have received a UW subsidy. These families represent 42% of all Income Eligible families, yet they comprise 52% of all families that received a United Way subsidy. Conversely, families in which the youngest child was nine years or above were significantly less likely than expected to have received a subsidy. In fact, only one out of the 28 such families received a subsidy from UW.

A series of cross-tabulations were then run to determine how the receipt or lack of receipt of a United Way subsidy may have affected the families' ability to cope with the loss of Income Eligible Day Care. The variables considered were the following:

- o ability to handle child care and work responsibilities
- o ability to achieve what the respondent wishes to achieve for the family
- o satisfaction with arrangements used since loss of county subsidy
- o need to become newly dependent on ADC, NPA-FS, NPA-MA since 7-1-81
- o number of children's problem areas identified
- o number of day care arrangements used currently

Surprisingly, the receipt of a UW subsidy since the loss of the county subsidy proved to be an insignificant determinant of the first four effects; i.e., those related to impacts on household heads. The last two, relating to impacts on the children, were significantly affected by receipt of a UW subsidy and will be considered in turn.

A summary analysis was made for each family of the number of the following areas which the respondent felt had become a problem for at least one child due to loss of the county subsidy: (1) children's behavior at home or in day care, (2) their health, (3) their safety, (4) their school performance. In effect, if at least one child in the family had a behavior problem the family was counted as having a problem in that area. Each family, then, was found to have from zero to four problem areas, corresponding to the variables just delineated.

Receipt/non-receipt of a UW subsidy since 7-1-81 was significant as a determinant of whether the respondent identified one or more problem areas. A

subsidy recipient was significantly less likely than non-recipients to mention a problem in the specified areas. UW recipients were more than one-third more likely to identify no problems as non-recipients. Clearly, receipt of a UW subsidy influenced at least the respondents' perceptions of problems within the family.

Another result of the receipt or lack of receipt of a UW subsidy appears to be the number of child care arrangements which the family is currently using. Families which have received a subsidy since 7-1-81 are significantly more likely than non-recipients to use just one or two total arrangements and conversely are much less likely than expected to use three or more. UW subsidy recipients were almost one-third more likely to use just one or two arrangements than were non-recipients.

B. Methods of Coping

In order to adjust to their loss of Income Eligible Day Care subsidies, the 111 families in the sample used various coping mechanisms as reported during their interviews. (Note that this sample can be generalized to the entire population losing subsidy--see the Technical Appendix.) This section will deal with five facets of this 18 month adjustment process: (1) the use of alternative child care arrangements or mechanisms for financing child care; (2) reliance on supplemental sources of income to offset increases in day care costs; (3) changes in household composition that might offer new opportunities for in-home care; (4) modifications of employment status; and (5) financial methods for dealing with loss of subsidy.

Child Care Arrangements: Number

The 111 families successfully interviewed by phone, mail or in-person had a total of 246 children living in the household at the time of the interview. They were first asked to indicate all methods by which children were cared for just prior to the loss of subsidy; a list of eight choices was given with space for other options. The results of an analysis of the number of "precut arrangements" used at least one day per week per child are as follows:

NUMBER OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS PER CHILD
JUST PRIOR TO 6-30-81

Number of Arrangements	Survey Children #	Survey Children %
1	145	59.0
2	79	32.1
3	18	7.3
4	4	1.6
Total	246	100.0

Total number of arrangements used in "Precut" Phase = 373
Total number of children = 246
Average number of arrangements per child = 1.5

The respondent was then asked to indicate all the alternative arrangements used per child for at least one consecutive week since the loss of subsidy. As opposed to the "precut" question which dealt with a point in time, this question asked the respondent for information on arrangements used over time--from July 1, 1981 to the date of the interview. As such, the number of arrangements used per child would be expected to increase and this is, in fact, the case.

NUMBER OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS PER CHILD
FROM DATE OF CUT TO DATE OF INTERVIEW

Number of Arrangements	Survey Children #	Survey Children %
1	69	28.0
2	87	35.4
3	57	23.2
4	26	10.6
5	3	1.2
Don't Know	4	1.6
Total	246	100.0

Total number of arrangements used since subsidy loss = 533
Total number of children = 246
Average number of arrangements per child = 2.2

The last question dealing with arrangements asked the respondent to provide information on current arrangements used for each child on a regular basis--at least once per week:

NUMBER OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS PER CHILD
USED EACH WEEK AS OF DATE OF INTERVIEW

Number of Arrangements	Survey Children #	Survey Children %
1	119	48.4
2	81	32.9
3	34	13.8
4	10	4.1
Don't Know	2	.8
Total	246	100.0

Total number of arrangements used currently = 423
Total number of children = 246
Average number of arrangements per child = 1.7

This table, showing current day care arrangements, is comparable to the "precut arrangements" table in that it too describes a point in time--the date of interview vs. a date just prior to the subsidy cut. It appears that the average number of arrangements per child has increased from 1.5 to 1.7 over the last 1-1/2 years. Moreover, the percentage of children in one arrangement only has decreased from 59.0 percent to 48.4 percent while the percentage using three or more arrangements per week has increased from 8.9 percent to 17.9 percent of the total survey children.

It can be hypothesized that these changes in the number of arrangements per child were caused by the elimination of Income Eligible Day Care and the resultant increased reliance on informal arrangements.

The recent study Day Care and the Working Poor: the Struggle for Self-Sufficiency, contends that "At worst, having too many caregivers can cause disruption in a young child's development, such as impaired social relationships, emotional disturbances, or learning difficulties. At least, it frequently causes feelings of anxiety and despondency."[2] Further analysis of the survey data to determine precisely the effects on the survey children's behavior based on the relative number of arrangements used for each child was not possible under current Project resources.

Child Care Arrangements: Types

The methods of child care used by the 111 sample families prior to the subsidy cut and at the point of interview are shown in the following table. Note that some of the 246 children used more than one arrangement.

TYPE OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS USED PRIOR TO SUBSIDY CUT AND CURRENTLY

Type of Arrangement	Instances of Use--Prior to Cut		Instances of Use--Currently	
	#	%	#	%
Structured method (day care center, certified provider)	172	46.1	59	14.0
Paid private sitter	12	3.2	22	5.2
Child in school but needed other form	71	19.1	112	26.5
Free care from relatives or friends	27	7.2	42	9.9
Older sibling provides care	10	2.7	33	7.8
Child home alone at least part of day	27	7.2	48	11.3
Child didn't need care	44	11.8	52	12.3
Mother/father cut back part of work hours--home with child at least part of day	0	0	21	5.0
Other	10	2.7	34	8.0
Total	373	100.0	423	100.0

The most apparent change is the significant drop in the use of structured methods (i.e., day care centers and certified family care providers). Presumably the requirement that these families assume part, if not all, of the cost of these types of care precipitated a move to other, less structured--and less expensive--forms of care such as use of older siblings, free care, or lack of care. At the same time, many of these children simply aged into the school-age or "didn't-need-care" brackets and, even more importantly, some mothers/fathers have cut back, either voluntarily or not, on their work hours and are therefore home with the children more frequently.

Much concern has been cited in day care literature about the apparent increase in the use of two forms of care (or lack of care): older children babysitting younger siblings and children who stay alone at least part of the day (latch-key children). Therefore, these occurrences were analyzed in some detail. From the previous table it can be seen that the instances of children being supervised by babysitting siblings in our sample group increased from ten(2.7 percent of all arrangements) to 33 (7.8 percent) and of latch-key children from 27 (7.2 percent of all arrangements) to 48 (11.3 percent). Looked at as a percent of total children needing care, meanwhile, the ten children being supervised by older siblings in 1981 are 5.0 percent of the 202 such children; the 33 in 1983 are 17.0 percent of the 194 children still needing care. The 27 children left alone at least part of the day in 1981 represent 13.4 percent of children needing care, while the 48 children in 1983 represent 24.7 percent of those still using care.

The increase in the incidence of these forms, however, tells only part of the story. A more detailed analysis of these groups as compared by age in 1981 and 1983 was performed to determine whether the average age of

supervising and supervised siblings, as well as those left alone part of the day, has decreased over time at the same time that their numbers have been increasing. Prior to the subsidy cut, the average age of babysitting siblings was 16, with a low of ten years. As of 1983, the average had dropped to 14.7 years with a low of nine years. On the other hand, the average age of children being babysat for by siblings has risen over this period from just over five years to just under eight years, with the lowest value rising from less than one year up to two years. These findings are shown in tabular form below.

AGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF BABYSITTING SIBLINGS
PRIOR TO SUBSIDY CUT AND CURRENTLY

Age of Babysitting Sibling	Babysitting Siblings - Prior to Cut		Babysitting Siblings - Currently	
	#	%	#	%
9	-	--	1	4.3
10	1	16.7	1	4.3
11	-	--	2	8.7
12	-	--	6	26.1
13-15	1	16.7	2	8.7
16-19	3	50.0	9	39.2
20+	1	16.7	2	8.7
Total	6	100.0	23	100.0

AGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF CHILDREN BEING SUPERVISED BY SIBLINGS
PRIOR TO SUBSIDY CUT AND CURRENTLY

Age of Child Being Supervised	Supervised Child - Prior to Cut		Supervised Child - Currently	
	#	%	#	%
1	1[a]	10.0	-	--
1	1[b]	10.0	-	--
2	-	--	1[c]	3.0
3	1	10.0	-	--
4-6	4	40.0	11	33.3
7-12	3	30.0	21	63.7
Total	10	100.0	33	100.0

[a]Sibling babysitter was 16 years old.
[b]Sibling babysitter was 10 years old.
[c]Sibling babysitter was 18 years old.

Due to the very controversial nature of the issue, considerable additional study was made of all instances of children who were left alone part of the day. In some cases, respondents had included children over age 12 in this category. The table on page 19 showing types of arrangements used included these instances because, given the option of saying "no care needed," respondents instead felt that these teenagers should be under care. However, most day care literature defines latch-key children as those left alone who are 12 or under. For purposes of producing detailed age distributions, therefore, adjusted figures were used. The age distributions for the 23 and 41 children in 1981 and 1983 respectively who were 12 or under and were being left alone are as follows:

AGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF CHILDREN TWELVE OR UNDER
BEING LEFT ALONE PART OF DAY
PRIOR TO CUT AND CURRENTLY

Age of Latch-key Child	Latch-key Children - Prior to Cut		Latch-key Children - Currently	
	#	%	#	%
4	1	4.3	1	2.4
5	4	17.4	1	2.4
6	2	8.7	4	9.8
7-9	6	26.1	15	36.6
10-12	10	43.5	20	48.8
Total	23	100.0	41	100.0
Mean	8.4 yrs.		9.2 yrs.	

The cases of children aged four, five and six were then examined in even more detail. In each of the two cases of four year olds whom respondents had reported were "home alone," an older sibling (age 10-11) was also reported to be "home alone." Although it is quite possible that the four year olds were truly home alone at least part of the day, one could legitimately suspect that the children were actually in more of a babysitting sibling arrangement.

In both years, however, undisputed cases were found of both five and six year olds home alone in which no sibling was simultaneously reported to be home alone.

The most likely explanation for the results of the three preceding age distribution tables lies in the stability and aging of the child population. Few families have added children, while the existing children have aged almost two full years. Thus, while the uses of the sibling babysitter and latch-key arrangements have increased, so have the ages of the children under these arrangements.[3]

Child Care Arrangements: Satisfaction

Respondents were asked to assess how satisfied they have been with the arrangements that they have needed to use since loss of the subsidy:

SATISFACTION WITH ALTERNATIVES USED
SINCE LOSS OF SUBSIDY

	Survey Families	
Level of Satisfaction Since Subsidy Loss	#	%
More satisfied since loss of subsidy	13	11.7
Less satisfied since loss of subsidy	56	50.5
About the same	33	29.7
Don't Know	9	8.1
Total	111	100.0

Clearly, over half of the respondents were more satisfied under the county subsidized arrangements. They were then asked how satisfied they are specifically with the current arrangements for each child. Forty-nine out of 111 respondents (44.1 percent) were dissatisfied with the arrangements for at least one of their children. The breakdown for the 194 children currently needing child care (in the opinion of the respondent) is as follows:

RESPONDENT SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT
ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN NEEDING CARE

	Survey Children Needing Care	
Satisfied	#	%
Yes	85	43.8
No	87	44.9
Don't Know	22	11.3
Total	194	100.0

Dissatisfied respondents were then asked what alternative forms they would prefer. Preference for day care centers was given in 41.6 percent of the cases, for family day care providers in 17.8 percent of the cases. Only 14 percent of the preferred choices was for the respondent to stay home full-time with the children.

Child Care Arrangements: Successful Adjustment

To offer a summary of how the respondents feel their families have coped with the county subsidy loss, they were asked how each of their children in retrospect has adjusted to arrangements made since loss of the subsidy:

LEVEL OF CHILDREN'S ADJUSTMENT
TO NEW ARRANGEMENTS

	Survey Children	
Level of Adjustment	#	%
Very well	74	30.1
Pretty well	55	22.3
Not very well at first, but o.k. later on	42	17.1
Not very well	13	5.3
Very badly	2	0.8
Don't know/No change	60	24.4
Total	246	100.0

These results indicate, then, that almost 70 percent of the children (whose adjustment levels were apparent to respondents) have adjusted over time very well or pretty well to post-cut arrangements. Only eight percent have adjusted not very well or very badly in the respondents' opinions.

As for the respondents themselves, they were asked to summarize how positive they feel now, compared to the time under the subsidy, about their "ability to achieve" what they want for their families:

RESPONDENT'S ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT ABILITY TO ACHIEVE FOR THE FAMILY

	Survey Respondents	
Ability to Achieve	#	%
More positive now	18	16.2
Less positive now	49	44.2
About the same	37	33.3
Don't know	7	6.3
Total	111	100.0

Those who felt less positive were then asked in what ways they feel less optimistic about their ability to achieve. Thirty-eight of the 49 respondents chose the option "feel less secure financially" either alone or with other options. The second most chosen option, either alone or with others (24 of the 49 respondents), was "have had to downgrade my goals for the future."

Reliance on Supplemental Sources of Income

The current out-of-pocket costs per week per family for respondents who provided information on current day care expenses (59 respondents) ranged from $5 to $115, with an average of $30.80 per family or $21.63 for each child in a paid arrangement. Family out-of-pocket costs are not available for the pre-cut stage but were undoubtedly lower due to the formerly subsidized nature of the structured forms of care.

To make up for the increased child care costs it might be expected that these families would search out supplemental forms of income beyond take-home pay as a method of coping. It appears from the available data that, on the contrary, the sources of income did not increase greatly:

SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFITS 1981 VS. 1983

Supplemental Benefits	Survey Respondents 1981 # of Recipients	Survey Respondents % of Total Surveyed	Survey Respondents 1983 # of Recipients	Survey Respondents % of Total Surveyed
Public Assistance	-	-	10	9.1
Supplemental Security Income	1	0.9	2	1.8
Social Security	4	3.6	3	2.7
Unemployment Insurance	2	1.8	10	9.1
Child Support	10	9.1	13	11.7
Other Income	8	7.2	10	9.1

A significant number of respondents had no source of income beyond take-home pay in 1981 (81 persons--73.0 percent of total surveyed) or 1983 (73 persons--65.8 percent).

In fact, a substantial number of persons have been "significantly affected" by the loss of benefits since loss of their county subsidy. The 31 out of 111 respondents (27.9 percent) so affected lost the following number of supplemental sources:

LOSS OF OTHER BENEFITS

Number of Benefits Lost	Families Losing One or More Sources #	Families Losing One or More Sources %
1 type	11	35.5
2	9	29.0
3	7	22.6
4	1	3.2
5	1	3.2
Don't Know	2	6.5
Total	31	100.0

The most frequently cited forms lost were Medicaid and Food Stamps.

Changes in Household Composition

It might also be expected that the terminated families would turn to extended family members or others to move into their homes in order to provide inexpensive, in-home alternatives to care. Survey results indicate, however, that household composition remained substantially unchanged from 1981 to 1983.

Of the 111 respondents, 108 were female; 19 (17 percent) said that they were married and living with their husbands at the time of the cut. Interestingly, only 13 of these 19 wives said that their husbands were available to help with child care after the subsidy cut. In total, in 1981, 28 respondents had persons living in the household who could help with child care; in 1983, 33 persons were identified. Conversely, 66.7 percent of the 111 respondent had no one in the household to help with child care in 1981; 64.9 percent still had no one available in 1983.

Modifications of Employment Status

One other area which respondents could be expected to "juggle" in order to cope with loss of subsidy is the employment arena.

Eight persons out of 111 (7.2 percent) interviewed quit work and have remained out of the workforce in order to handle child care.[a] Of the 103 who did not quit and stay out, 20 (19.4 percent) reduced work hours as a result of new child care arrangements as shown in the following table:

REDUCTION IN WORK HOURS SINCE SUBSIDY LOSS

Number of Reduced Hours per Week	Survey Respondents Who Reduced Hours	
	#	%
1 to 5 hours	6	30.0
5+ to 10 hours	4	20.0
10+ to 15 hours	2	10.0
15+ to 20 hours	5	25.0
+20 hours	3	15.0
Total	20	100.0

[a]Of these eight, five have gone on ADC; three have never applied since 6-30-81 for ADC, NPA-MA or NPA-FS.

If their day care arrangements could be improved, 15 of these 20 respondents (75 percent) would again increase their work hours.

Of the 103 respondents who did not quit work permanently, another 18 (17.5 percent) underwent a job change other than reduced work hours in order to cope with child care needs. The 18 changes involved place of employment and/or work shift.

A summary question was asked of all those who had not quit upon loss of subsidy to assess how difficult it is now vs. under the subsidy to handle child care and work responsibilities:

ABILITY TO HANDLE CHILD CARE AND WORK RESPONSIBILITIES SINCE LOSS OF SUBSIDY

	Survey Respondents	
Ability to Handle	#	%
Less difficult now	10	9.7
More difficult now	42	40.8
About the same	44	42.7
Don't Know	7	6.8
Total	103	100.0

For over 40 percent of the respondents, then, adjustments in work hours/schedules/etc. have not offset the disruptions of losing the county subsidy.

Financial Coping

Respondents were asked how they have dealt with the loss of of the day care subsidy (and other social services/ benefits) by modifying the family's financial habits. Of the 111 respondents, 90 (81.1 percent) reported using one or more methods. The 254 instances of actions were as follows:

FINANCIAL METHODS FOR COPING
WITH SUBSIDY LOSS

Method	Instances of Use #	Instances of Use %
Sometimes cannot pay bills on time	70	27.6
At times run out of money completely	63	24.8
Do not buy adequate food, clothing or medicines for family	54	21.3
Need to borrow money from other people, bank, lending company	50	19.7
Other	9	3.5
Don't Know	8	3.1
Total	254	100.0

Thirty-six (32.4 percent) of the 111 respondents reported using all of the first four methods in order to juggle their finances.

C. Dependency Issues

Forms of Dependency

The section of this analysis entitled "Lost Benefits" provided information on the 83 Income Eligible Day Care recipients who, on June 30, 1981, were dependent on either NPA-MA or NPA-FS or both and the percentage of these persons who remained dependent following the elimination of their county day care subsidies.

In addition, since June 30, 1981, some of these 83 families have increased or decreased their forms of dependency and some of the remaining 210 families have become dependent on various forms of welfare (namely, ADC/HR, NPA-MA, NPA-FS) on which they were not dependent while receiving their day care subsidies.[4] It is impossible to predict if, were Income Eligible Day Care subsidies to have continued, these same persons would just as likely have increased their forms of dependency or would have become newly dependent on these same forms. An analysis of the 293 families from June 30, 1981 to March 15, 1983 indicates that 150, or a full 51.2%, were dependent on ADC, NPA-MA or

NPA-FS at some time during that period; 83 (or 28.3%) were, as reported previously, already dependent on NPA-MA and/or NPA-FS at the time of the subsidy cut. Quite obviously, then, this population can be termed chronically, marginally dependent; i.e., some of those who increased their dependency after the subsidy cut would undoubtedly have done so without the subsidy cut.

As a warning, then, no direct cause and effect relationship could be drawn in this study between loss of subsidy and changes in dependency. All that can be said is that, since their county Income Eligible subsidies ended, these families applied separately for and received the following forms of welfare which they had not previously been receiving:

WELFARE PROGRAMS APPLIED FOR SEPARATELY AND RECEIVED SINCE SUBSIDY TERMINATION (BEGAN RECEIVING JULY 1, 1981 OR LATER: NOT RECEIVING AT TIME OF SUBSIDY TERMINATION)

	Terminated Families	
Program Type	#	%
ADC, NPA-MA and NPA-FS	10	3.4
ADC (might also include Food Stamps under the Public Assistance case)	34	11.6
NPA-MA	5	1.7
NPA-FS	26	8.9
ADC and NPA-MA	8	2.7
ADC and NPA-FS	7	2.4
NPA-MA and NPA-FS	9	3.1
No increase in form of dependency	194	66.2
Total	293	100.0

The 99 families who became newly dependent on one or more forms of welfare after the county day care subsidy cuts represent 33.8 percent of the 293 Income Eligible families.

In addition to these families who began receiving ADC, NPA-MA or NPA-FS after June 30, 1981, when they were not receiving them on that date,

other families applied for one or more of these forms of welfare since that time but have been denied, as detailed in the following table:

FAMILIES APPLYING FOR SEPARATE WELFARE PROGRAMS
BUT DENIED SINCE 6-30-81

Program Type	Terminated Families Denied Benefits #	%
ADC, NPA-MA and NPA-FS	1	2.0
ADC (might also include Food Stamps under Public Assistance case)	21	41.2
NPA-MA	14	27.4
NPA-FS	6	11.8
ADC and NPA-MA	4	7.8
NPA-MA and NPA-FS	5	9.8
Total	51	100.0

These 51 families who applied for but were denied one or more forms of welfare after the county day care subsidy cuts represent 17.4 percent of the 293 Income Eligible families.

A cross-check was performed of the 99 families who began receiving one or more forms of welfare after June 30, 1981, that they had not received at the time of the subsidy cut vs. those 51 who have applied for and been denied one or more forms since June 30, 1981. Nineteen families were in both groups. Therefore, an unduplicated count of families who became newly dependent on one or more forms of welfare to which they had not been dependent on June 30, 1981, or who applied for and were denied one or more forms since that time is 131--or 44.7 percent of the 293 Income Eligible families.

Dates of Denied Application

Each form of dependency (ADC/HR, NPA-MA and NPA-FS) was analyzed separately to determine how soon after June 30, 1981 these families applied and either were granted or were denied benefits. The results are as follows:

TIME PERIOD FOLLOWING TERMINATION IN WHICH FAMILIES BECAME DEPENDENT ON, OR APPLIED FOR AND WERE DENIED, NEW FORM(S) OF WELFARE

	Applying Families					
	(ADC)		(NPA-MA)		(NPA-FS)	
Time Period After 6-30-81	#	%	#	%	#	%
3 mos.	33	38.9	14	25.0	25	39.1
3 mos. to 6 mos.	9	10.6	8	14.3	7	10.9
6 mos. to 9 mos.	13	15.3	10	17.9	4	6.3
9 mos. to 12 mos.	7	8.2	4	7.1	7	10.9
12 mos. to 15 mos.	9	10.6	5	8.9	7	10.9
15 mos. to 18 mos.	7	8.2	8	14.3	8	12.5
18 mos.+	7	8.2	7	12.5	6	9.4
Total	85	100.0	56	100.0	64	100.0

In all three cases, between 25 and 40 percent of the new or denied dependencies began less than three months following loss of the Income Eligible subsidy. At least 50 percent of each type of denied or accepted application took place within nine months of the families' losing the county subsidy.

Current Participation in Welfare

As of 3-15-83, the following numbers of former Income Eligibles are participating in one or more types of welfare programs, as compared with the number of these families who were dependent at the time of the cut:

DETAILED TABLE OF DEPENDENCY STATUS ON JUNE 30, 1981 (AT TIME OF SUBSIDY CUT) AND ON MARCH 15, 1983

	1983 Form of Support						
1981 Form of Support	None	ADC[a]	ADC & NPA-FS	NPA-MA	NPA-FS	NPA-MA & NPA-FS	Total
None	172	20	2	2	9	5	210
NPA-MA	2	--	-	2	-	1	5
NPA-FS	33	5	1	-	7	3	49
NPA-MA & NPA-FS	16	5	1	1	2	4	29
Total	223	30	4	5	18	13	293

[a]Might also include Food Stamps under the Public Assistance case. Based on the most recently available report on non-NYC recipients (1979), 81% were receiving Food Stamps under the Public Assistance case. As such, it can be estimated that 24 of these 30 families were also receiving Food Stamps.

Although the number of dependent families has decreased from 83 to 70, particularly as a result of decreases under NPA-FS, the 34 families who began receiving ADC represent an increase in level of dependency.

Analyzed from a somewhat different perspective, the 293 families can be categorized as follows based on their dependency status between 6-30-81 and 3-15-83:

SUMMARY OF DEPENDENCY STATUS

	Terminated Families	
Dependency Status	#	%
Never dependent during period	143	48.8
Not dependent at time of cut--then temporarily active--no longer dependent on 3-15-83	29	9.9
Dependent at time of cut--no longer dependent on 3-15-83	51	17.4
Not dependent at time of cut--active as of 3-15-83	38	13.0
Dependent at both points in time	32	10.9
(Dependent on same form of welfare	(16)	
(Dependent on new form of welfare	(16)	
Total	293	100.0

The 70 families currently participating in one or more programs comprise 23.9 percent of the 293 former Income Eligible families. Fifty-four families have become newly dependent on one or more forms since June 30, 1981--16 who were dependent on another lesser form of welfare at the time of the cut and 38 who were not dependent at the time of the cut. On the other hand, 51 (17.4%) of the families were dependent on the welfare system at the time of the cut but no longer are.

As was stated previously, this population can be termed chronically, marginally dependent; 11% were dependent at both checkpoint dates and 40% during the interim bounced on and off the system. Therefore, it should once

again be cautioned that some families who increased their dependency after the subsidy cut would undoubtedly have done so regardless.

Determinants and Effects of Welfare Dependency

Cross-tabulations were performed using the following variables to determine if any were significant determinants of whether a family became newly dependent on one or more forms of welfare on which they were not dependent on 6/30/81:

- o receipt of United Way subsidy since loss of county subsidy
- o number of children less than three
- o number of children less than six
- o number of children aged six to eleven
- o age of household head
- o number of children
- o age of youngest child

Of these, only two related variables proved to be significant determinants of new dependency: number of children less than six and age of youngest child. Families that had a youngest child aged less than six were significantly more likely to become newly dependent. Families with a youngest child less than six were 40 percent more likely than those wih a youngest child six or older to become newly dependent.

Cross-tabulations were also performed to determine how the receipt or lack of receipt of welfare since June 30, 1981 (including continuation of dependency from prior to the cut) may have affected the families' ability to cope with the loss of Income Eligible Day Care. The variables considered were the following:

- o ability to handle child care and work responsibilities
- o ability to achieve what the respondent wishes to achieve for the family
- o satisfaction with arrangements used since loss of county subsidy
- o number of day care arrangements used currently
- o number of children's problem areas identified

The receipt of ADC, NPA-FS or NPA-MA since the loss of county subsidy proved to be a significant determinant only of the last variable. Respondents who have received at least one form of welfare since 6/30/81 were significantly more likely than non-recipients to have no recognized family problems in the four specified areas; that is, significantly less likely to have had one or more problems. Welfare recipients were over 40 percent more likely to have no recognized problems than non-recipients.

Other Services Dependency

At the point of termination of their Income Eligible Day Care subsidies, most of the 293 families were removed from the county "Services" active file. Seven families continued on in other forms of service; 14 other families have resumed service cases since being cut off on June 30, 1981. These 21 families represent 7.2 percent of all Income Eligible families. Eleven of these cases are currently active.

A check of the service codes under which these cases have operated reveals five cases of protective day care (four newly opened since June 30, 1981) and four cases of preventive day care (three opened since termination of Income Eligible Day Care). In addition, six cases of foster care service codes were found--five of which have opened since June 30, 1981. No examination of these service cases was possible and therefore no clear connection can be traced at this time between the twelve newly opened cases and the loss of county day care subsidies.[5]

D. Other Consequences/Problems of Subsidy Loss

The 111 sampled heads of households were asked a series of questions on how their families were specifically affected, either negatively or

positively, by the loss of county subsidy. (Note that this sample can be generalized to the entire population--see the Technical Appendix.) Two broad areas were explored, with detailed questions included under each heading: (1) the long-term effects on the children in regard particularly to their home/day care behavior, health, safety and school performance; and (2) the short-term and long-term ramifications for the head of household personally.

Children's Behavior in Home or Day Care

As shown in the following table, of the 246 children of survey respondents, 88 (35.7 percent) were reported to have home/day care behavior affected--either positively or negatively--by changes in day care arrangements. Of these 88 children, five were affected only positively, 78 only negatively, and five children exhibited both positive and negative effects.

EFFECTS ON CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR TIED BY PARENT TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

Type of Behavior Change Identified	Survey Children #	Survey Children %
Positive	5	2.0
Mixed positive/negative	5	2.0
Negative	78	31.7
No change	158	64.3
Total	246	100.0

The parents of the five children showing only positive behavior consequences noted eight total examples of such positive behavior: three instances in which a child has become "more extroverted" and five cases where a child "gets along more compatibly with other children." The five children showing mixed behavioral effects were comprised of two children being "more extroverted" (along with negative effects) and three exhibiting "less aggression/hostility" (along with negative effects).

Meanwhile, the parents of the 78 children affected only negatively offered 123 instances of such negative behaviors as follows:

NEGATIVE CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR TIED BY PARENT TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

	Instances of Behavior (78 Children)	
Negative Behavior	#	%
Is more withdrawn	29	23.6
Exhibits more agression/hostility	35	28.4
Gets along less compatibly with other children	28	22.8
Has been involved in criminal activity	1	0.8
Other[a]	30	24.4
Total	123	100.0

[a]Includes examples of children who crave parental attention more frequently now, who are more often bored by lack of playmates or structured stimulation and have become more defiant and/or mischievious, and children who appear to be rebelling against increased babysitting responsibility.

In all, 26 of the 111 respondents surveyed (23.4 percent) identified at least one child who has shown a negative behavior problem.

Effects on Children's Health

As shown in the following table, of the 246 children of survey respondents, 32 (13.0 percent), in their parent's opinion, have shown health effects from changes in day care arrangements caused by cut in subsidy.

EFFECTS ON CHILDREN'S HEALTH TIED BY PARENT TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

	Survey Children	
Type of Health Effect Identified	#	%
Positive	9	3.7
Negative	23	9.3
No change	214	87.0
Total	246	100.0

Of the 32 affected children, nine have shown only the positive effect of being "kept home from school/child care less frequently due to illness." The remaining 23 children have exhibited a total of 27 types of negative health effects, as follows:

NEGATIVE HEALTH EFFECTS TIED BY PARENT TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

	Instances of Effects (23 Children)	
Negative Health Effects	#	%
Kept home more frequently due to illness	12	44.5
Has been involved in a pregnancy	1	3.7
Appears to be using alcohol or drugs	0	0
Lacks needed medical services due to limited family resources	5	18.5
Other[a]	9	33.3
Total	27	100.0

[a]Includes examples of children who now have poorer nutrition since they no longer receive hot meals at a day care center, children who appear more tired than under previous arrangements, and one child who was hit by a bus going to her new care.

In all, 13 of the 111 respondents surveyed (11.7 percent) identified at least one child who has shown a negative health effect.

Effects on Children's Safety

As seen in the table below, of the 246 children of survey respondents, 80 (32.5 percent) are currently in at least one child care circumstance which causes their parents to worry.

EFFECTS ON CHILDREN'S SAFETY TIED BY PARENT TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

	Survey Children	
Type of Effect on Safety Identified	#	%
Negative	80	32.5
No effect	166	67.5
Total	246	100.0

The 109 specific worrisome arrangements which were identified are shown below:

CURRENT CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS WHICH CAUSE PARENTS TO WORRY ABOUT SAFETY

Arrangement	Instances of Use (80 Children) #	%
Child is left alone for at least part of day	38	34.9
Child left with too young/inexperienced caregiver	40	36.7
Caretaker is physically incapable of providing adequate care	8	7.3
New arrangement involves more children, less supervision	16	14.7
Other[a]	7	6.4
Total	109	100.0

[a]Includes some instances in which parents are unsure of the qualifications of new caregivers and worry that the caregiver may be hurting their children emotionally (through neglect) or even physically. Also includes examples in which parents generally worry about their children lacking structured supervision.

In all, 44 of the 111 respondents surveyed (39.6 percent) worry about the safety of at least one of their children under current child care arrangements.

Changes in School Performance

As seen in the accompanying chart, of the 183 children who were in school at the time of the county subsidy cut, 29 (15.8 percent) have exhibited either positive or negative changes in school performance which the parents attribute to new care arrangements used by the family.

EFFECTS ON SCHOOL PERFORMANCE TIED BY PARENT TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

Type of School Performance Change Identified	Survey Children in School at Time of Cut #	%
Positive	3	1.6
Negative	26	14.2
No change	154	84.2
Total	183	100.0

In many cases, even though the older children themselves did not undergo changes in arrangements, they have been affected by new family arrangements (e.g., they now must babysit for younger siblings or must do more housework to allow head of household to work more hours). The inventory of the 49 negative effects recounted by parents of the 26 adversely affected children is shown below:

NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON CHILDREN'S SCHOOL PERFORMANCE TIED BY PARENTS TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

	Instances of Use (26 Children)	
Negative School Performance	#	%
Receives poorer grades	18	36.7
Has lost interest in doing well	13	26.5
Does homework less consistently	14	28.6
Other[a]	4	8.2
Total	49	100.0

[a]Includes instances of difficulty passing to the next grade level, defiant attitudes toward school, and emotional problems being evidenced on psychological tests.

In all, six of the 111 respondents surveyed (5.4 percent) identified at least one child who has exhibited worsened school performance that the parent ties to the cut in subsidy and subsequent changes in arrangements.

Meanwhile, the three children who have shown school performance improvement under new arrangements all have reportedly received better grades, been more motivated to do well, and have done homework more consistently.

Effects on Heads of Households

The 111 heads of households surveyed were also asked a series of questions about how they themselves have been affected by the cut in subsidy and the subsequent need, in many cases, to make new arrangements. Of the 111 respondents, 49 (44.1 percent) lost time from work/school immediately after

the subsidy loss in order to arrange for child care. Of these 49 who lost time, 29 took off 2 weeks or less from regular activities; five needed four weeks or more to make these adjustments.

Literature in the day care field notes that heads of households who use unstructured forms of care vs. day care centers/certified providers must more frequently fall back on last-minute arrangements. Since unreliable forms of care are said then to affect the employment status of the household head when he/she must arrive late to work, stay home, etc., a series of questions on this topic were posed to respondents to ascertain if loss of the county subsidy had caused such effects.

Of the 111 respondents, 57 (51.3 percent) do indeed need to rely on last-minute emergency back-up methods of care more frequently now than before the subsidy cut, as detailed below:

DAYS PER MONTH ON WHICH CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS PROVE MORE UNRELIABLE THAN FORMER ARRANGEMENTS

Days per Month	Survey Respondents #	Survey Respondents %
0	54	48.7
1-5	27	24.3
6-10	5	4.5
11-15	5	4.5
Don't Know (but more than 0)	20	18.0
Total	111	100.0

Respondents were then asked for a general assessment of how child care arrangements used since the subsidy cut have affected their employment status in the long run. Results are shown in the table below. Of the 103 respondents who did not quit work upon the loss of subsidy, three feel that the effects have been all positive ("more punctual now/attendance more regular

now"). In addition, three people have experienced these positive effects along with some negative.

EFFECTS ON EMPLOYMENT STATUS TIED BY RESPONDENT TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

Type of Effect on Employment Identified	Respondents #	Respondents %
Positive	3	2.9
Mixed positive/negative	3	2.9
Negative	49	47.6
No effect	48	46.6
Total	103	100.0

The 49 persons (47.6 percent) who feel their employment status has been affected negatively by the need to arrange child care or new financing offered 85 instances of negative effects as detailed below:

NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON EMPLOYMENT STATUS SINCE SUBSIDY LOSS

Negative Effect	Instances of Effects (49 Respondents) #	Instances of Effects (49 Respondents) %
Less punctual now	23	27.1
Attendance less regular now	25	29.4
Can't work overtime any more	20	23.5
Can't accept additional responsibility	17	20.0
Total	85	100.0

Finally, a question was posed to the 111 survey respondents regarding whether they have had any personal problems coping with the loss of subsidy. As shown in the table below, 25 of the 111 respondents (22.5 percent) reported no such problems; the remaining 86 persons reported a total of 159 problems.

EVIDENCE OF PERSONAL PROBLEMS TIED BY RESPONDENT TO CHANGES IN DAY CARE SUBSIDY AND ARRANGEMENTS

Personal Problem(s) Identified	Survey Respondents #	Survey Respondents %
Yes	86	77.5
No	25	22.5
Total	111	100.0

The 159 specific instances of problems are detailed below:

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD PERSONAL PROBLEMS
COPING WITH THE SUBSIDY CUT

Personal Problem	Instances of Problem (86 Respondents) #	%
Increased stress	70	44.0
Frequent signs of illness, such as headaches	34	21.4
Strained personal relationships	24	15.1
Emotional/psychological problems	16	10.1
More frequent use of drugs or alcohol	7	4.4
Other[a]	8	5.0
Total	159	100.0

[a]Includes instances of increased smoking and difficulty sleeping.

Many of these household heads commented in the interviews that, rather than allow their children to be affected, they prefer to keep the family's financial and other problems from the children. Since the vast majority of these cases are single women with no adult housemates, the women as a result tend to confront their problems alone.

III. POLICY CONCLUSIONS

A. Overview of Findings/Implications

The findings of this survey offer compelling reasons to be concerned about the provision of day care subsidies to certain lower income families. Not only did these subsidies enhance the quality of life of many hundreds of children and their parents, but, in addition, these subsidies provide an effective tool in reinforcing individual work efforts.

The survey shows that the loss of a day care subsidy had many negative effects:

- o Instances of children left alone increased (from seven percent pre-cut to 11 percent post-cut).
- o Most parents were less satisfied with day care arrangements after the cut.
- o Over 40 percent of the parents felt less secure and less able to achieve for their families after the cut.
- o Approximately seven percent of the parents reported having to quit work and remain out of the labor force in order to provide child care (due to subsidy loss).
- o Another 19 percent of the parents had to reduce work hours after the cut to accommodate new arrangements.
- o Many families were financially stressed to the point of not buying adequate food, clothing or medicines.
- o Over one-third of the children losing day care subsidies exhibited negative behavioral effects.
- o Nearly one-third of the children losing day care subsidies are currently in child care arrangements which parents feel are unsafe (e.g., child is left alone, child is left with a too-young caregiver, insufficient supervision).
- o Fourteen percent of children who were in school at the time of the subsidy cut have exhibited only negative changes in school performance.
- o Over half of the parents need to rely on last-minute emergency backup methods of care more frequently since the subsidy cut.

- Nearly half of the parents reported that their employment status has been negatively affected since the loss of subsidy and the need to make new, less secure child care arrangements.

This summary of findings admittedly focuses on the problem areas discovered by the survey. As explained throughout this report, no single survey can provide definitive information on cause and effect relationships. However, the survey findings do represent clear indicators concerning day care services and lower income families--as reflected above. While this evidence is incomplete in many areas (as noted in this report), it is nonetheless sufficient to indicate that properly targeted day care subsidies are cost effective.

Thus, in terms of the threshold policy issue of having or not-having a local day care subsidy program for lower income families, the results of this survey are positive. Of course, this survey does not and can not suggest the relative importance or contribution of day care subsidies compared to other social services needs. Such priority setting must take place through a Title XX-type priority-setting process--as discussed below.

On the issue of targeting such subsidies, the survey results are less clear. However, it appears that services should be stressed for families whose youngest child is less than six and whose income is between poverty level and 150 percent of poverty level (e.g., roughly $8,000 to $12,000 for a family of three). Such families are less likely to be eligible for welfare programs under current rules but are in serious risk of becoming dependent.

B. Perspective on the Income Issue

It is worthwhile to reflect on the income resources available to the families losing day care subsidies--within a community context. How do such families compare with various measures of well-being?

The estimated average gross income of those losing day care subsidies was $10,500 (in March, 1983) or 128 percent of poverty (using the February, 1983 poverty line). As pointed out in another Data Sharing Project paper (Cutting Welfare Benefits to Working Mothers), the poverty line is not a magic number with regard to determining whether or not assistance should be provided. The Cutting Welfare paper also notes that the 150 percent standard-of-need rule (used for determining eligibility for basic income assistance) has allowed families above the poverty line (e.g., approximately 105 percent of poverty in 1981 for a family of three) to remain on welfare in New York State. In addition, the Food Stamp program actually uses 130 percent of the poverty line (a higher base than the so-called "standard of need") as its assistance cut-off point. Indeed, federal programs have a variety of income eligibility criteria for various forms of "public" assistance--with eligibility often extending to cover those with incomes above the median.

As noted in the previously mentioned report, the definition of the poverty line itself is often criticized as being unrealistically low and understating the needs of a family for a minimum adequate level of income. Interestingly, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' report (NEWS, 82-139, 4/16/82) on urban family budgets for the autumn of 1981 indicated that the total annual "lower" budget for a four-person family was $14,710 in Buffalo, N.Y. (nearest metropolitan area for which data were produced). An

"intermediate" budget was calculated at $26,473 and a "higher" budget was $38,919. For the lower budget, it was calculated that $4,517 would be required for food expenditures alone. Admittedly, these are intended only as hypothetical budgets portraying three relative standards of living--lower, intermediate, and higher. However, these budgets help place the incomes of the families losing day care subsidies in perspective. With this in mind, it is also worth noting that the 1982 estimated median income in Monroe County is $30,320.

The point to be made here is that we are talking about lower income families, on average. Many of these families are in fact very near the poverty level. Many encounter work-related expenses that result in marginal discretionary incomes. Indeed, in terms of income-level, many of the families in this day care survey overlap those included in the previously cited report (Cutting Welfare) concerning loss of basic income assistance (ADC). These ADC families had an average gross income of approximately $9,100 in March, 1983 as compared to the day care families (with an average of $10,500 in March, 1983).

It is also worth noting that even though county policy permitted eligibility at levels approaching 175 percent of the poverty level, the average recipient of day care subsidies had a significantly lower income. The positioning of the eligibility threshold involves issues of service structure and access, as discussed below.

C. Recent Policy Directions

New Funding

The increased availability of certain intergovernmental aid has recently enabled Monroe County to reassess its policy on Income Eligible Day

Care. The proposed 1984 budget calls for the reinstatement through 1984 of 500 day care slots for children of working parents earning 65 percent or less of the state median family income adjusted for family size ($12,993 for a family of three). The funding (totalling $1.3 million) comes from several sources, including: the Federal Emergency Jobs Act; the increased federal Title XX ceiling; and county Title XX funds matched by state funds. (Another paper in this series, Title XX Services--Background Paper, explores Title XX funding issues.)

To keep the reinstated eligibility levels in perspective, it should be noted that in July, 1980, individuals receiving Income Eligible subsidies became eligible at the 70th percentile of state median income. By the time these subsidies were eliminated in July, 1981, the eligibility level had already been reduced to 58 percent. Therefore, the newly proposed level falls in this range.

Service Access Issues/Flexibility

The issue of the demand for subsidized day care slots has been a recurrent one and reappeared concerning the slots re-established late in 1983. It may be argued that the "demand," expressed by client applications, for subsidized day care is an overall indicator of need. However, there is evidence that such expressions of demand are not good indicators of meeting actual need. For example, as pointed out in this paper, the elimination of Income Eligible subsidies necessitated the use of other less structured forms of care. In the two years since the cut, household heads have pieced together the most workable alternatives possible under the circumstances and have made personal and family adjustments to accommodate these changes. It will take

time for these household heads to hear about the new slots, to feel assured of their relative permanence and finally to commit to them by forsaking their substituted alternatives. This survey indicates that there is a definite need to heavily publicize day care subsidy programs and what is proposed. The recent change in policy which committed the county to the 500 slots through 1984, as opposed to only mid-1984, should go a long way toward reassuring target families.

In addition, as also supported by the Cutting Welfare report, a voucher system should be considered as a supplement to the present slot system, whereby the county would subsidize more types of day care alternatives used currently by these families. Such a system might help reach more of the high priority families mentioned above.

Securing Funding/Title XX Planning/Related Efforts

Additional steps could also be taken by the county to insure that the current $1.3 million funding level be maintained as long as a need is indicated or revised based on need indicators. Since part of the funding is coming from short-term federal aid, creative approaches should be considered over the next year to compensate for the possible loss of this support at the end of 1984. In this way, the disruption experienced by subsidy recipients in July, 1981, as described in this report, may be avoided or minimized.

The solution most likely lies with the Title XX planning process. In light of the admittedly tenuous nature of the renewed Income Eligible funding, an updated Three Year Plan for Day Care Services could be prepared under direction of the Title XX Steering Committee. As constituted in 1981, a new "Long Range Day Care Study Committee" staffed by United Way and DSS could be

charged with considering options for future delivery of day care services to be included in the county's Consolidated Services Plan.

At the same time, the Title XX planning process should continue to accommodate input from a wide variety of community groups on the issue of how best to allocate Title XX resources to all social services including Income Eligible Day Care. To avoid the hostility and countercharges which occurred subsequent to the 1981 subsidy elimination, facts concerning county finances and relative service needs should be shared in an open and clearly publicized forum with ample opportunity for discussion of relative community priorities by business leaders, service providers, consumers of various social services, city and county staff, and the United Way.

Beyond the need for a stable county commitment to day care subsidies for low income working families, a need exists for supplementary private and public support. Avenues which the community could pursue to insure continuing availability of such day care include:

- o before and after school care for preschool and primary school age children in school and/or recreation facilities (with the additional benefit of eliminating the stigma of ties to a system of "dependency");
- o possible free use of county facilities as day care centers by non-profit or church affiliated groups;
- o more widespread use of satellite family care homes tied to established day care centers;
- o more innovative public policies such as the recently announced county use of a state grant to train and hire welfare recipients to provide family day care;
- o exploration of increased United Way and DSS funding of day care subsidies for part-time workers and students;
- o greatly enhanced interest on the part of business leaders in establishing on-location day care centers and subsidizing employees using outside sources.

Recognition of Future Trends

Recent data (1983) from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that nationally 53 percent of children in two-parent families have working mothers, including more than 46 percent of children under age six.* National data indicate that most working mothers--more than 70 percent of those with school-age children and 62 percent of those with preschoolers--work full time. This trend appears to have increased in recent years and will likely continue to do so. Again, on a national level, women with children under the age of three are the most rapidly growing part of the labor force--the proportion of these mothers in the job market has increased from 34 to 46 percent since 1975.

Locally, in the Rochester urbanized area, Census data show that these national trends have been repeated. In 1980, in households with husbands present, 42.3 percent of married women (16 years and over) with own children under six years of age were in the labor force--this represents a 72 percent increase over 1970. In similar households, but where children were 6 to 17 years old, even more women were in the labor force--62.4 percent in 1980 or nearly one-third more than in 1970.

For women without husbands present, 52.3 percent with children under six were in the labor force in 1980 (slightly more than the 50.7 percent in 1970); while 79.4 percent of female heads with children 6 to 17 were working (compared to 73.7 percent in 1970).

*Sheila B. Kamerman, "The Child Care Debate: Working Mothers vs. America," Working Woman, November 1983, p. 132.

In 1980, such female-headed families, in Monroe County, comprised 63 percent of all poor households (up from 44 percent in 1970). Further, more female-headed households were poor in 1980 than in 1970 (27.2 percent in 1980 compared to 22 percent in 1970). Over the last decade, the number of dependent children living in poor families also increased significantly--by nearly 29 percent (from 17,094 in 1970 to 22,006 in 1980). We estimate that most of these children (90 percent) live in female-headed households.

These trends should seriously concern all those responsible for day care funding and programming both at higher levels of government and locally. These trends, in combination with the findings of this survey, indicate that the problems of adequate child care, parental employment, and the meeting of basic family needs are highly interrelated.

The fact that, over the last decade, more female-headed households with children are living in poverty even while these same household heads increased their labor force participation rates, indicates that not only subsidized day care but other social programs might require retargeting or expansion. At the local level, such expansion might include employment training, family planning, and even family/marriage counseling efforts.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX
SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Background. The Monroe County Department of Social Services furnished CGRI with its list of income eligible day care recipients slated for termination on June 30, 1981. The sizes of the Group II and Group III populations were originally thought to be 198 and 130, respectively, for a total of 328. (See the joint DSS and UW report, Cutting Day Care: The Impacts of Reducing Day Care for Low Income Clients, February, 1982.) The list of recipients actually contained 199 group and 129 family care clients for this same total of 328. The following adjustments were then made to these figures to arrive at the eventual total population count:

- Of the 129 case numbers on the family care list, no service case histories existed in the DSS system for four of them.
- Seventeen cases were uncovered in which, at the time of the subsidy cut, the head of household was receiving subsidized day care through Basic Assistance. Based on the definition, then, these families were not income eligible and so were excluded from the sample.
- Five persons, when contacted by phone, indicated that they had not been cutoff by DSS on June 30, 1981, due to changes in eligibility but rather had been for some other unrelated reason--coincidentally on that date. For instance, some had not reapplied for personal reasons; some changed their employment status and therefore had been cut at that time.
- Nine cases were identified in which the same family was on the group care and family care list.

The final population counts, then, were 191 families whose DSS subsidies were cut but who became eligible for a UW subsidy and 111 family care recipients who, after June 30, 1981, were ineligible for any subsidy. Since nine cases overlap Groups II and III, the total unduplicated population count was 293.

Survey. In order to contact former recipients, addresses and phone numbers were taken from the DSS computer system. These addresses and phone numbers were those obtained at the time of the former recipients' most recent contact with the Services, Basic Assistance (ADC, Home Relief or Emergency Assistance to Families), Food Stamps, or Medicaid systems. Further information was obtained from the United Way Day Care Management Services Unit files and the R.L. Polk and Co. directories for Rochester and suburban Monroe County. In addition, lists of names, addresses and most recent telephone numbers were sent to the Rochester Telephone Co., which responded with notations of current telephone numbers and indications of "no listing" or "unlisted number."

A first mailing was made in March to all terminated clients informing them of the Project and survey and requesting their participation (see Technical Appendix for copy of questionnaire). They were asked to return a stamped postcard to the Center indicating their current phone number and any preferred calling times. A total of 27 individuals responded to this first request.

Volunteers from the Masters in Public Administration program at the State University College at Brockport were used through the cooperation of Professor Sarah Liebschutz, Ph.D. Each of the 12 volunteers, in addition to two in-house staff members, was given an average of 16 people to contact (229 potential contacts in all). The 27 persons who returned postcards were included in this first round interviewing effort as well as 202 others with phone numbers verified by DSS or UW.

The volunteers were given only the phone numbers and, for ease of interviewing, the first names of all children. Last names were given only in

cases where the client requested to be contacted on the job. Phone interviewing took place in March and April with the following results:

Successfully Completed Survey	62
Refused Interview	30
No Contact Possible	10
Needed Follow-up	127

A second round of interviewing was then determined to be necessary based on the following considerations:

- o No attempt had been made to contact some of the individuals who had been assigned to first-round interviewers;
- o Recent phone numbers had been determined for some of the individuals not assigned in the first round;
- o Experiences gained during the first round made it feasible to attempt phone contact with families of 5+ children who had been set aside during the first round;
- o A response rate greater than the first-round 25% was desired.

In April, letters were sent to those who had not been contacted in the first round and who had not had all phone and address leads exhausted. The second-round letters offered, via a stamped return postcard, the possibility of phone or in-person interview or mailed questionnaire. In addition, address correction was requested from the Postal Service in order to identify forwarding addresses. This information permitted us to request phone numbers from the phone company using more recent addresses; it was also felt to be necessary if unsolicited home visits or mail surveys were to be performed. Ultimately it was determined that unsolicited home visits would not be undertaken because of the volunteer effort that would have been required and the questionable nature of some addresses. The desirability of sending out

unsolicited mail surveys was also discussed. It was decided that the length of the survey (11 pages) and the complexity of answering questions by child would deter individuals from responding unless they were given a monetary incentive, which was beyond the resources of the project. A shortened version of the questionnaire was also considered but complete information was felt to be most desirable. Consideration was then given to mailing out, as a last resort, a condensed questionnaire to those persons whose interview status had still not reached closure following the second-round of interviews. The response to a third mailing by persons who had not responded to two previous mailings was anticipated to be poor and the costs to the Project in terms of postage, staff time, and delay in survey analysis were determined to be offsettingly great. In the end, unsolicited mail surveys were not sent.

Nineteen postcards were returned--three requesting in-person interviews, five requesting phone interviews and eleven wanting mailed questionnaires.

In April and May, volunteers were obtained through Genesee Ecumenical Ministries and the Diocese of Rochester Office of Social Ministry. Nine volunteers were assigned a total of 83 individuals for interviews--the eight that had responded with postcards and 75 other individuals who had not had contact completed in the first round or who had had more recent phone numbers discovered since the first round. By using in-house staff, CGRI retained responsibility for contacting individuals who had requested daytime interviews or who, because of questionable addresses, had never received a letter informing them of the Project. After second-round volunteers returned their interview forms in May, Center staff attempted contact with those individuals for whom little or no attempt at contact was made by volunteers.

In the second-round interviewing effort, names as well as phone numbers of former recipients were shared with volunteers. Because some of the phone numbers were almost two years old, this procedure was found to be more expedient in determining whether the interviewer had reached the desired person who was refusing an interview or whether the person reached had in fact never had a subsidy cut. It also decreased the numbers of requests to "call back" from people later determined not to be the desired parties.

At the end of the survey phase of the study in June, the status of the contacts with the 293 former recipients was as follows:

Successfully completed survey	111	(5 in-person; 9 by mail)
Refused interview	32	
No contact possible[a]	35	
Unable to contact known phone number[b]	27	
No phone listing, known address[c])	80	
Unlisted phone, known address[c])		
Mail survey requested, not returned	8	
	293	

The 38 percent response rate is acceptable for surveys of this type considering that the time lapse between termination and interview was as much as 23 months. A similar study in New York City reported a 21 percent response rate (see Community Service Society of New York, Day Care and the Working Poor, April, 1982). Moreover, that study involved face-to-face interviews for a $5 respondent payment and interviewers were paid $30 per completed interview.

[a]All phone and address leads exhausted or recipient moved out of area.
[b]Attempts to call or visit ended in busy signals, no answers or requests to "call back."
[c]Contact would require unsolicited home visit or mail survey.

Data Collection from the
Department of Social Services

In order to characterize the total terminated population, to determine the representativeness of the interviewed sample and to ascertain the number of former day care subsidy recipients who later came on various forms of assistance, data was collected from the Department of Social Services computer system on each family included in the sample. (In fact, this data collection effort assisted in defining the sample--see Background.) The following information was collected:

SERVICE
- o active service case since 6/30/81?
- o if not, ever applied and been denied?
- o if active since cut, type of service code
- o date of first receipt after 6/30/81 or date of first denial
- o currently active in service?
- o if so, current service code

ADC/HR (Basic Assistance)
- o receiving ADC/HR at time of cut?
- o received ADC/HR since 6/30/81?
- o if not, ever appplied and been denied?
- o date of first receipt after 6/30/81 or date of first denial
- o currently active under ADC/HR?

- o received EAF since 6/30/81?
- o if not, ever applied and and been denied?
- o date of first receipt after 6/30/81 or date of first denial

NPA-MA and NPA-FS (Non-Public Assistance Medicaid and Food Stamps)

- o receiving at time of cut?
- o received since 6/30/81?
- o if not, ever applied and and been denied?
- o date of first receipt after 6/30/81 or date of first denial
- o currently active?

SAMPLE BIAS AND LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

The representativeness of the sample with regard to the following variables was ascertained:

- last known address
- number of children
- age of youngest child
- number of children less than three
- number of children less than six
- number of children aged six through eleven
- age of household head
- whether a UW subsidy has been received since the county subsidy cut
- whether the client has received ADC, NPA-FS or NPA-MA since the county subsidy cut

In all cases except last known address, no sample bias was found, indicating that the results obtained from the interviews could be safely generalized to the entire population terminated from the Income Eligible Day Care program on June 30, 1981. Representativeness was deteruined by cross-tabulating the number in the population who were successfully interviewed/not interviewed by these variables. The same general results were found where the more detailed cross-tabulation was performed for these variables by the breakdown of interviewed/refused/not interviewed except that "number of children aged six through eleven" was found to be a significant determinant of interview disposition at the .10 level.

As regards last known address, the Chi-square test indicated that the interviewers were significantly more likely than expected to get a successfully completed interview in all zip codes considered "suburban" in nature; i.e., Suburbs, Greece/Irondequoit and Southeast City/Brighton. In fact, for the zip codes combined under the label "Suburbs", a prospect was over 1.5 times as likely to be reached for a successful interview as would have been expected on a strictly random basis.

On the other hand, residents in most city zip codes were successfully interviewed at either the expected rate or slightly below. The two areas of Federal Station (Midtown) and West Ridge/Lyell were more noticeably under-represented.

Several possible, and distinctly different, impacts of this suburban oversampling come to mind; for example, suburban residents were more readily contacted through listed phone numbers and were more willing to talk, indicating less adverse effects of the subsidy cut vs. their residence in the suburbs implies a heightened desire for mobility and thus more severe feelings of frustration at the loss of this marginal support.

The consequences for data analysis, that is, whether the observed client impacts may have understated or overstated the actual case, cannot be known without further cross-tabulations which are beyond the current resources of this project. In any case, given the results of the tests on the other eight variables, it appears likely that a claim of relative representativeness of the sample is nonetheless justifiable.

The limitations of the current research, however, should be recognized. The interviewed sample included only those individuals who were able to be located and, in general, interviewed by telephone. Speculation on those who could not be reached revolved around whether these individuals were better off, perhaps having married and thus having become unknown by their former names, or whether they were worse off, having perhaps moved into an abandoned car in a vacant lot.

Similar concerns arose with regard to those with known addresses but unknown phone numbers (and, therefore, possibly no phones) versus those with

known addresses but unlisted phone numbers. Five percent of the population was unable to be reached because of unlisted phone numbers; some of those who were contacted also had unlisted phones which were obtained from various non-phone company sources, including returned postcards. Twenty-three percent of the population was unable to be reached because of unknown (possibly no) phone numbers; some of those who were contacted had no phones but rather were contacted via friends, relatives, or work. In general, experience showed no basic differences among those with phones, those with no phones, and those with unlisted numbers. In fact, a number of individuals went from one to another of these categories as interviewers attempted to contact them.

The timing of the survey may also have had some effect on the results. The time since termination range from approximately 20-1/2 months to almost 23 months depending on the timing of the interview or returned mail survey. Differential timing of the interviews may have yielded slightly different results.

Average times between termination of county subsidy and application and receipt/denial for ADC, NPA-FS and NPA-MA were, as an example, constrained by timing of the sample. Assuming that additional individuals have had subsequent contact with the welfare system, these average times would be marginally greater.

NOTES

I. INTRODUCTION FOOTNOTES

[1]Group care is provided in licensed not-for-profit or proprietary day care centers; family care refers to care for up to six children in a private home certified by Monroe County Department of Social Services.

[2]Although all of these families technically became eligible for the UW subsidy, a detailed check of the current UW active and inactive files, supplemented by billing printouts for October, 1981 and 1982, revealed that only 113 of the close to 200 original families have ever taken advantage of their initial eligibility. Many reasons are possible (e.g., some children entered school in the fall of 1981 or reached sufficient age that day care was not needed; changing family circumstances caused UW ineligibility, such as household head entering school full-time; or the family simply could not afford to pay the required fee).

[3]See "Methodology" section for discussion of the ultimate population sizes for Groups II and III.

[4]Monroe County Dept. of Social Services, Cutting Day Care: The Impacts of Reducing Day Care for Low Income Clients, February, 1982. p. 1.

[5]DSS, p. i.

[6]ibid.

[7]DSS, p. 8.

II. FINDINGS FOOTNOTES

[1]Family size as of June 30, 1981. Family composition in some cases changed since termination from the Income Eligible Day Care program; however, because information for the entire population was available only for the time of termination, this information is being used in the population analysis.

Questions were asked of the sampled group regarding children who entered the household since June 30, 1981 and, conversely, those who no longer lived in the household. Ten families had added one additional child each--nine were cases of new births and one involved adoption of a 13 year old. These families represent 3.4 percent of the whole population.

In addition, eight families interviewed contained a total of eleven children who no longer lived in the household. The various reasons given included the following: child now living with ex-spouse, child now living with other relatives, child now living on his/her own, child joined Air Force and child now deceased. Interestingly, in no case did the head of household choose the response that the reason for the child's move was "inability to find adequate day care." These eleven children represent 1.7 percent of the known number of children in the population.

[2]Day Care and the Working Poor: the Struggle for Self-Sufficiency, Community Service Society of New York, 1982, page 62.

[3]At the same time, an analysis was performed of the age of children whom parents remarked were "in school but needing other day care." In both 1981 and 1983, the average age cited was eight, with a minimum value of three years.

[4]Emergency Assistance to families (EAF) was not considered under this matrix since emphasis was given to long-term (e.g., 3 months or longer) forms of dependency. EAF is a program providing "emergency help to families . . . who have suffered some sort of disaster, such as fire, flood, etc., or who need temporary assistance for housing, food or utility costs"--County of Monroe 1982 County Budget Plan Detail, p. 347.

Information on EAF dependency was collected, however, revealing the following facts: 39 families out of a possible 293 (13.3 percent) have received EAF for at least one day since June 30, 1981. Of these 39, four families (10.2 percent) received it less than three months following the subsidy cut, eight (20.5 percent) received it three months to just less than six months after the cut, and an additional 17 (43.6 percent) from six months to just less than one year following June 30, 1981.

[5]Preventive services are those designed to prevent family dysfunctioning and break-up, and to avert placement of children outside their homes. Protective services include investigation of child abuse and mistreatment and identification of potential cases with the goal of minimizing abuse and neglect. Foster care services include those related to placement of children outside their homes.

QUESTIONNAIRE

(Separately paged)

77

SUBSIDIZED DAY CARE DATA SHARING
INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Case # _____

Interviewer # _____

May I please speak to the mother or father of the house?

Hello. My name is _____. I am working for the Human Services Data Sharing Project. I believe you received a letter this month telling you about what we're doing. We're trying to find out how families are coping since their day care subsides were reduced or eliminated during 1981 as a result of changes in eligibility laws. Is this a good time for you to talk with me?

Okay, let's begin. (Mark start time on call sheet.)

1. I believe that you had (the number)_____ child(ren) living with you at the time your subsidy was cut and that the name(s) was/were _____.

[If the respondent disagrees, make sure to mention the date the subsidy was cut and stress we are interested in children then living in the household.

If the respondent still feels our data are incorrect, make changes on the profile. Be sure to answer profile questions 4, 5, 9, 10 for additional children.]

2. Are any of these children not living with you currently?

Yes ___1 Go to #3
No ___0 Skip to #5
Don't Know ___9 Skip to #5

	Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
3. Which child(ren) is/are no longer living with you? (Check the box which corresponds to the name as given in the profile.)	___1	___2	___3	___4

4. What is the reason the child(ren) is/are are no longer living with you?

(Summarize circumstances below and, if possible, check all codes that apply.)

Inability to find adequate day care ___1
Child's physical illness ___2
Child in institutional care ___3
Child in foster care ___4
Child now living with ex-spouse ___5
Child now living with other relative ___6
Other (specify) _____ ___7

5. Since the date your day care subsidy was cut, have any additional children under the age of 16 entered your household?

Yes	1	Go to #6
No	0	Skip to #7
Don't Know	9	Skip to #7

6. Name(s) of child(ren) who entered your household since your subsidy was cut. (Look at Profile Question #4. What is the next available empty column? Start listing additional children using that new column.)

Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
_____ 1	_____ 2	_____ 3	_____ 4
(name)	(name)	(name)	(name)

7. Before your subsidy was cut, what day care arrangements did you use for (name)_____ at least one day per week?

(GIVE ANSWERS FOR ALL CHILDREN LISTED IN THE PROFILE IN THE ORDER AS GIVEN. READ EACH CHOICE.)

	Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
a. Family day care subsidized by county	a. ____ 01	____ 01	____ 01	____ 01
b. Day care center subsidized by county	b. ____ 02	____ 02	____ 02	____ 02
c. Free care from relatives or friends	c. ____ 03	____ 03	____ 03	____ 03
d. Child in school but needed other day care	d. ____ 04	____ 04	____ 04	____ 04
e. Older brother/sister provided care (Specify care giver name _____)	e. ____ 05	____ 05	____ 05	____ 05
f. Child home alone at least part of day	f. ____ 06	____ 06	____ 06	____ 06
g. Child didn't need day care	g. ____ 07	____ 07	____ 07	____ 07
h. Other (specify) _____	h. ____ 08	____ 08	____ 08	____ 08
i. Don't Know	i. ____ 09	____ 09	____ 09	____ 09

8. What alternative day care arrangements have you used for (name) _____ for at least one consecutive week since your subsidy was cut off?

(Summarize below and if possible, check all codes that apply. READ EACH CHOICE.)

	Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
a. Maintained arrangement that you had under the subsidy by paying additional fee	a. ____ 01	____ 01	____ 01	____ 01
b. Chose a day care center	b. ____ 02	____ 02	____ 02	____ 02
c. Chose a family care arrangement	c. ____ 03	____ 03	____ 03	____ 03
d. Relied on free care from relatives or friends	d. ____ 04	____ 04	____ 04	____ 04
e. Child in school but needed other day care	e. ____ 05	____ 05	____ 05	____ 05

	Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
f. Older brother/sister provided care (Specify care giver name _____)	f. ____ 06	____ 06	____ 06	____ 06
g. Child home alone at least part of day	g. ____ 07	____ 07	____ 07	____ 07
h. No longer working or reduced work hours to be home with child	h. ____ 08	____ 08	____ 08	____ 08
i. Child didn't need day care	i. ____ 09	____ 09	____ 09	____ 09
j. Other (specify) _____	j. ____ 10	____ 10	____ 10	____ 10
k. Don't Know	k. ____ 99	____ 99	____ 99	____ 99

I'm going to ask now about how losing your day care subsidy may have caused hardship for you.

9. Were you married and living with a spouse at the time your subsidy was cut?

Yes ____ 1
No ____ 0
Don't Know ____ 9

10. Did you (or your spouse) lose time from work/school because of time needed to make new child care arrangements immediately after your subsidy was cut?

Yes ____ 1 Go to #11
No ____ 0 Skip to #12
Don't Know ____ 9 Skip to #12

11. How many days did you need to take off from these activities after your subsidy was cut?

0 - 6 days _____ 1
1 - 2 weeks _____ 2
More than 2 weeks, less than 4 weeks _____ 3
More than 4 weeks _____ 4
Don't Know _____ 5

12. Since your subsidy was cut, have you needed to rely on last-minute emergency back-up methods of care more frequently than you did before your subsidy was cut?

Yes ____ 1 Go to #13
No ____ 0 Skip to #14
Don't Know ____ 9 Skip to #14

13. Approximately how many more days per month have you needed to use last-minute alternatives than you did before your cut in subsidy?

_____ days
Don't Know ____ 99

14. Compared to the arrangements you used while on your subsidy, how satisfied are you with the arrangements you have needed to use since that time?

More satisfied now _____ 1
Less satisfied now _____ 2
About the same _____ 3
Don't Know _____ 9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

80

Now I would like to ask you about your employment since your subsidy was cut.

15. Did loss of your subsidy force you (or your spouse) to quit work and remain out of the work place completely?

Yes ___1 Skip to #23
No ___0 Go to #16
Don't Know ___9 Go to #16

16. Have you (or your spouse) needed to reduce work hours because of your new child care arrangements?

Yes ___1 Go to #17
No ___0 Skip to #19
Don't Know ___9 Skip to #19

17. By how many hours per week did you (or your spouse) cut back?

_____hours
Don't Know ___99

18. If your day care arrangements could be improved would you (your spouse) again increase work hours?

Yes ___1
No ___0
Don't Know ___9

19. Did loss of your subsidy result in a job change for you (or your spouse)?

Yes ___1 Go to #20
No ___0 Skip to #21
Don't Know ___9 Skip to #21

20. What type of change?
(Read the list and check as many as apply.)

Change in place of employment _____1
Change in position at same place of business _____2
Change in shift _____3
Other (specify) _____ _____4
_____
Don't Know _____9

21. How else have your new child care arrangements since loss of the subsidy affected your (or your spouse's) employment?

(Read the list and check as many as apply.)

More punctual now _____1
Less punctual now _____2
Attendance more regular now _____3
Attendance less regular now _____4
Can't work overtime any more _____5
Can't accept additional responsibility _____6
No effect _____7
Don't Know _____9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

22. Compared to before your subsidy was cut, how difficult is it for you or your spouse to handle your child care and work responsibilities?

Less difficult now	1
More difficult now	2
About the same	3
Don't Know	9

Now I would like to ask you about how your child(ren) was/were affected by the loss of your day care subsidy. Respond for each child listed in the profile.

23. Did resulting changes in day care arrangements affect (name) _____'s behavior at home or in day care?

Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
yes 1	yes 1	yes 1	yes 1
no 0	no 0	no 0	no 0
Don't Know 9	Don't Know 9	Don't Know 9	Don't Know 9

[For each child for whom "yes" is checked, go to #24. Otherwise, skip to #25.]

24. What specific type of behavior change has occurred with these new arrangements? (Summarize circumstances below and, if possible, check all codes that apply.)

	Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
a. Is more withdrawn	a. 01	01	01	01
b. Is more extroverted	b. 02	02	02	02
c. Exhibits more aggression/hostility	c. 03	03	03	03
d. Exhibits less aggression/hostility	d. 04	04	04	04
e. Gets along less compatibly with other children	e. 05	05	05	05
f. Gets along more compatibly with other children	f. 06	06	06	06
g. Has been involved in criminal activity	g. 07	07	07	07
h. Other (specify) _____	i. 08	08	08	08
i. Don't Know	i. 99	99	99	99

25. Did resulting changes in day care arrangements affect (name) _____'s health?

Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
yes 1	yes 1	yes 1	yes 1
no 0	no 0	no 0	no 0
Don't Know 9	Don't Know 9	Don't Know 9	Don't Know 9

[For each child for whom "yes" is checked, go to #26. Otherwise, skip to #27.]

26. What specific type of health change have you noticed with these new arrangements? (Summarize circumstances below and, if possible, check all codes that apply.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
a. Has been kept home more frequently due to illness	a. ____ 01	____ 01	____ 01	____ 01
b. Has been kept home less frequently due to illness	b. ____ 02	____ 02	____ 02	____ 02
c. Has been involved in a pregnancy	c. ____ 03	____ 03	____ 03	____ 03
d Appears to be using alcohol or drugs	d. ____ 04	____ 04	____ 04	____ 04
e. Other (specify) _____	e. ____ 05	____ 05	____ 05	____ 05
f. Don't Know	f. ____ 09	____ 09	____ 09	____ 09

27. Did loss of your subsidy require you to use day care arrangements which made you worry about (name) _____'s safety?

Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
yes ____ 1	yes ____ 1	yes ____ 1	yes ____ 1
no ____ 0	no ____ 0	no ____ 0	no ____ 0
Don't Know ____ 9	Don't Know ____ 9	Don't Know ____ 9	Don't Know ____ 9

[For each child for whom "yes" is checked, go to #28. Otherwise, skip to #29.]

28. What specific arrangement has caused you to worry? (Summarize circumstances below and, if possible, check all codes that apply.)

	Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
a. Child is left alone for at least part of day	a. ____ 01	____ 01	____ 01	____ 01
b. Child is left in care of someone who is too young/inexperienced	b. ____ 02	____ 02	____ 02	____ 02
c. Caretaker is physically incapable of providing adequate supervision	c. ____ 03	____ 03	____ 03	____ 03
d. Day care used since loss of subsidy involves more children, less supervision	d. ____ 04	____ 04	____ 04	____ 04
e. Other (specify) _____	e. ____ 05	____ 05	____ 05	____ 05
f. Don't Know	f. ____ 09	____ 09	____ 09	____ 09

[Ask the following question about all children who were in school at the time of the subsidy cut.]

29. Did subsequent day care arrangements result in changes in _____'s school performance?

Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
yes ____ 1	yes ____ 1	yes ____ 1	yes ____ 1
no ____ 0	no ____ 0	no ____ 0	no ____ 0
Don't Know ____ 9	Don't Know ____ 9	Don't Know ____ 9	Don't Know ____ 9

[For each child for whom "yes" is checked, go to #30. Otherwise, skip to #31.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Child #1	Child #2	Child #3	Child #4
30. What specific type of change have you seen in school performance? (Summarize examples below and, if possible, check all codes that apply.)				
a. Receives poorer grades	____01	____01	____01	____01
b. Receives better grades	____02	____02	____02	____02
c. Has lost interest in doing well	____03	____03	____03	____03
d. Is more motivated to do well	____04	____04	____04	____04
e. Does homework less consistently	____05	____05	____05	____05
f. Does homework more consistently	____06	____06	____06	____06
g. Other (specify) _____ _____	____07	____07	____07	____07
h. Don't Know	____09	____09	____09	____09
31. In general, how well has (name)_____ adjusted to your family's new day care arrangements since you subsidy was cut? (Read choices, check one.)				
a. Very well	____01	____01	____01	____01
b. Pretty well	____02	____02	____02	____02
c. Not well at all at first, but okay later on	____03	____03	____03	____03
d. Not very well	____04	____04	____04	____04
e. Very badly	____05	____05	____05	____05
f. Don't Know	____09	____09	____09	____09

Now I would like to ask you about how YOU have adjusted to the loss of your day care subsidy.

32. Have you (and or your spouse) had any personal problems coping with the loss of subsidy. (Summarize comments below and, if possible, check off as many codes as apply.)

a. Increased stress	____1
b. Frequent signs of illness, such as headaches	____2
c. Strained personal relationships	____3
d. Emotional/psychological problems	____4
e. More frequent use of drugs or alcohol	____5
f. Other (specify) _____ _____	____6
g. None	____7
h. Don't Know	____9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

33. Compared to the period when you were receiving the subsidy, how positive do you feel about your ability to achieve what you want for your family?

More positive now	1	Skip to #35
Less positive now	2	Go to #34
About the same	3	Skip to #35
Don't Know	9	Skip to #35

IF LESS POSITIVE:

34. In what ways do you feel less optimistic? (Summarize response below and, if possible, code all the appropriate responses.)

a. Less secure financially	1
b. Have had to downgrade my goals for the future such as by leaving school, cutting work hours, leaving training program	2
c. Feel that I can never get ahead or make it on my own	3
d. Other (specify) _____	4
e. Don't Know	9

Now I would like to ask you how you feel about your current day care arrangements.

Once again, could you give me the names of all children living with you now, oldest to youngest, who are using some form of day care.

(name)	(name)	(name)	(name)

Interviewer: In the spaces below marked child # ____, enter the Child # code as assigned previously in the profile or in Question #6.

35. For each child, describe all the major forms of day care currently used for each child on a regular basis - at least once per week.

(Summarize below and, if possible, code all applicable responses.) READ ALL CHOICES.

	Child #	Child #	Child #	Child #
a. Same day care center/family care provider as used under subsidy	01	01	01	01
b. Different or new day care center	02	02	02	02
c. Different or new family care provider	03	03	03	03
d. Free care from relatives or friends	04	04	04	04
e. Child in public school but needs other day care	05	05	05	05
f. Older brother/sister provides care (specify care givers name) _____	06	06	06	06
g. Child home alone at least part of day	07	07	07	07
h. Other (specify) _____	08	08	08	08
i. Don't Know	09	09	09	09

85

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Child #	Child #	Child #	Child #
36. How many hours per week is (name) _____ in day care (other than school)?	_____ (hours)	_____ (hours)	_____ (hours)	_____ (hours)
	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99
37. Are you satisfied with the arrangement(s) for (name) _____?	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1
	no ___ 0	no ___ 0	no ___ 0	no ___ 0
	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9
[For each child for whom "no" is checked, go to #38. Otherwise, go to #39.]				
38. What type of arrangement would you prefer? (Summarize comments below and, if possible, code all applicable responses.)				
a. (Different) day care center	a. ___ 01	___ 01	___ 01	___ 01
b. (Different) family care arrangement	b. ___ 02	___ 02	___ 02	___ 02
c. (Different) unpaid sitter	c. ___ 03	___ 03	___ 03	___ 03
d. (Different) paid sitter	d. ___ 04	___ 04	___ 04	___ 04
e. Would like to stay home full-time with child(ren)	e. ___ 05	___ 05	___ 05	___ 05
f. Other (specify) _____	f. ___ 06	___ 06	___ 06	___ 06
g. Don't Know	g. ___ 09	___ 09	___ 09	___ 09
39. Are you currently receiving a county grant or subsidy to cover (name) _____'s day care?	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1
	no ___ 0	no ___ 0	no ___ 0	no ___ 0
	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9
[For each child for whom "yes" is checked, go to #40. Otherwise, skip to #41.]				
40. What is the amount of subsidy/grant per week for (name) _____'s day care?	$_____	$_____	$_____	$_____
	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99
41. Are you currently receiving a United Way day care subsidy for (name) _____?	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1	yes ___ 1
	no ___ 0	no ___ 0	no ___ 0	no ___ 0
	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9	Don't Know ___ 9
[For each child for whom "yes" is checked, go to #42. Otherwise skip to #43.]				
42. What is the amount of subsidy per week?	$_____	$_____	$_____	$_____
	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99	Don't Know ___ 99

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

43. What is your total out-of-pocket cost per week for your child care arrangements?

$_____
Don't Know ___ 99

44. Have you been significantly affected by the loss of any other types of social services or benefits since the time your subsidy was cut?

Yes ___ 1 Go to #45
No ___ 0 Skip to #46
Don't Know ___ 9 Skip to #45

45. What benefits or services might those be? (Rely on prompter list if respondent cannot immediately specify.)

ADC ___ 01
Food Stamps ___ 02
Medicaid ___ 03
Heat/Energy Assistance ___ 04
Special Food Program for Pregnant Women & Babies (WIC) ___ 05
Free or Reduced Price School lunches ___ 06
Other (specify) _____ ___ 07
_____
Don't Know ___ 09

46. What effects have the loss of the day care subsidy and any other Social Services had on you and your family's ability to pay bills, or purchase things.

(Summarize comments below and, if possible, check all codes that apply. READ ALL CHOICES.)

a. Have at times run out of money completely ___ 01
b. Do not have enough money at times to buy adequate food, clothing or medicines for family ___ 02
c. Sometimes cannot pay bills on time ___ 03
d. Needed to borrow money from other people, a bank or lending company ___ 04
e. Other (specify) _____ ___ 05
_____
f. None ___ 06
g. Don't Know ___ 09

I have just a few more questions; they deal with your household characteristics before and after you lost your subsidy. The time periods to consider are the time you were getting a subsidy and now.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

47. What adults who could help you with child care lived with you in your household then and who does now?

	1981	1983
Husband	1	1
Parent	2	2
In-law	3	3
Sister/Brother	4	4
Friend	5	5
Other	6	6
None	7	7
Don't Know	9	9

48. What was the approximate take-home pay per month for all persons living in your household then and what is it now?

(Summarize respondent's answer here for later coding, if necessary)

	1981	1983
$_____/mo.		
Don't Know	999	999

49. Did you then and do you now receive additional monthly income from the following sources? [Read all choices]

	1981	1983
a. Public Assistance (ADC)	1	1
b. Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	2	2
c. Social Security	3	3
d. Unemployment Insurance	4	4
e. Child Support	5	5
f. Other (specify) _____	6	6
_____		
g. None	7	7
h. Don't Know	9	9

50. What is the sex of the respondent? (By observation)

a. Female	1
b. Male	0

51. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about how you're handling your day care arrangements since your subsidy was cut?

Thank you very much for participating in this survey. You have been very helpful to us. Do you have any questions you'd like to ask me?

Thanks again. (Mark stop time on call sheet.)

53. Respondent seemed to understand:

All of the questions	1
Most of the questions	2
Some of the questions	3
Very few of the questions	4

54. Respondent was:

Very cooperative	1
Somewhat cooperative	2
Not very cooperative	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE